



# **Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Report Fiscal Year 2021**

# OUR MISSION

*Empower Missourians  
to live safe, healthy, &  
productive lives*



 *Missouri Department of*  
**SOCIAL SERVICES**



---

MICHAEL L. PARSON, GOVERNOR • ROBERT J. KNOELL, ACTING DIRECTOR  
DARRELL MISSEY, DIRECTOR  
CHILDREN'S DIVISION  
P.O. BOX 88 • JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65103-0088  
WWW.DSS.MO.GOV • 573-522-8024 • 573-526-3971 FAX

Dear Reader:

Thank you for your interest and concern regarding child abuse and neglect in Missouri. This report contains information regarding reports and referrals to the Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline during Fiscal Year 2021, July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. It includes the substantiation status of the reports and the number of children and families served by a program within the Missouri Children's Division.

Any questions about the report should be directed to the Children's Division within the Department of Social Services.



AUXILIARY AIDS AND SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

TDD / TTY: 800-735-2966

RELAY MISSOURI: 711

*Missouri Department of Social Services is an Equal Opportunity Employer/Program.*



---

## ***Table of Contents***

---

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Reports.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline .....	2
Reporters .....	3
<b>Child Protection System: Assessments &amp; Investigations.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Observed Family Characteristics .....	7
Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion .....	9
<b>Assessment Conclusions .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion.....	11
Demographics of Assessment Children.....	13
<b>Substantiated Conclusions .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	15
Observed Family Characteristics .....	18
Demographics of Substantiated Children .....	19
Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities .....	20
<b>Perpetrators .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Perpetrator Demographics .....	23
Observed Perpetrator Characteristics .....	24
<b>Prevention/Treatment Services .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Family-Centered Services (FCS) .....	25
Intensive In-Home Services (IIS) .....	26
Out-of-Home Placement .....	26
Child Care .....	26
Crisis Nurseries .....	26
Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board .....	27
Background Screening and Investigation Unit .....	27
Calls from Reporters .....	27
Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services .....	28
<b>Appendices .....</b>	<b>29</b>
A. Reported Incidents by Conclusion .....	30
B. Reported Children by Conclusion .....	32
C. Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type .....	34
D. Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type .....	36
E. Family Assessment Incidents by Conclusion .....	38
F. Family Assessment Children by Conclusion .....	40
G. Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	42
H. Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect .....	44
I. Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year .....	46
J. Legal and Methodological Definitions .....	48



---

## ***Introduction***

---

This report compiles data collected by the Missouri Department of Social Services (DSS), Children's Division (CD), in the course of Child Abuse and/or Neglect (CA/N) investigations/assessments during the fiscal year, July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021. As a result of pending investigations or changes in conclusions, the data is prone to change. The data reported is current as of November 2021.

The Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline Unit (CANHU) accepts confidential reports of suspected child abuse, neglect, or exploitation. Missouri's toll-free number for reporting child abuse/neglect is **1-800-392-3738**. Mandated reporters can also report online at <http://dss.mo.gov/cd/can.htm>.

The CANHU is operated year-round on a 24 hours per day, seven days per week basis. It was staffed by 51 full-time and 12 part-time trained and experienced Children's Service Workers during the fiscal year. A call to the hotline is referred to as a "report" or "reported incident" of child abuse/neglect. A report may involve from one to several children. Over the course of the fiscal year, the hotline had received over 54,000 reported incidents that involved over 77,000 children in Missouri.

When a call is received at the CANHU, information is analyzed to determine whether:

- the child is under age 18;
- the alleged perpetrator has care, custody and control of the child;
- the report meets the legal definition of abuse and/or neglect as stipulated in 210.110, RSMo (see Appendix J definitions).

After a report of suspected abuse, neglect, or exploitation has been made to the hotline, the information is forwarded electronically to one of the 114 county offices or the St. Louis City office for either investigation or assessment. A report indicating behavior that may constitute a criminal violation is screened as an investigation and law enforcement is contacted to co-investigate. Reports of child abuse/neglect that do not appear to be of a criminal nature may be responded to as an assessment, where resources or services may be offered to the families to help prevent abuse or to meet a family's specific need. During FY 2021, thirty-seven percent (37.5%) of reports taken by the CANHU were assigned as investigation and fifty-eight percent (58.2%) as family assessments. Four percent (4.3%) were assigned as juvenile assessments, where a child under the age of fourteen is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against a person under the age of eighteen.

Investigations/assessments must be initiated within 24 hours, or immediately when it is determined that the child is in imminent danger. When the only allegation is educational neglect, or the allegation is an old allegation and the child is protected, an investigation/assessment must be initiated within 72 hours.

Unless there is good cause, Children's Service Workers complete investigations and family assessments within 45 days of report, and juvenile and differential response assessments within 90 days. At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion. Of the 77,108 children with reports in FY 2021, 4,688 (6.1%), were substantiated as abused/neglected.

## Reports

### Reports to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline

Over the past fiscal year, the CANHU received 128,801\* hotline calls. Of those reports, 54,515 were classified as Investigations or Assessments and were completed by the Children's Division. A total of 77,108 children\*\* were involved in the investigations/assessments.

#### Incidents and Children Reported to the Child Abuse/Neglect Hotline


Year	Total Reports	Annual Change	Total Children**	Annual Change
2017	68,014		98,270	
2018	73,924	8.7%	106,090	8.0%
2019	64,920	-12.2%	89,738	-15.4%
2020	55,853	-14.0%	78,328	-12.7%
2021	54,515	-2.4%	77,108	-1.6%

*\*Data provided by CANHU; excludes calls classified as Prior Checks or Other.*

*\*\* All counts of children are duplicated because a child may be reported more than once during the year. Total reports include only reports with a Type of Response of Investigation or Assessment and completed by field staff. Other CANHU reports requiring staff attention or action but do not meet the requirement for Investigation or Assessment are not included in the overall count.*

Comparing months, April had the highest number, and July the least, of both reported incidents and children. During FY 2021, an average of 4,543 reports involving 6,426 children were made each month.

#### FY 2021 Child Abuse/Neglect Reports and Children by Month of Report






---

## Reports

---

A child may be reported as an alleged victim more than once during the year. In FY 2021, a total of 62,436 children had been involved in one or more reports. The majority of children (82.5%) had been reported only once; thirteen percent (13.3%) were involved in two reports. Four percent (4.2%) were involved in more than two reports.

**Number of Reported Incidents Per Child during FY 2021**




## Reporters

Reports of child abuse/neglect can be made by persons who are either "mandated" or "permissive" reporters. Mandated reporters are required by state statute to report abuse/neglect when they have reasonable cause to suspect a child has been or is being abused or neglected. Mandated reporters include, but are not limited to, health and education professionals, social workers and foster parents. Permissive reporters, such as relatives or neighbors, are not required to report suspected abuse/neglect.

More than one reporter may be involved in a report to the hotline. The majority of reporters during FY 2021 were mandated reporters.

**Type of Child/Abuse Neglect Reporters during FY 2021**



---

## Reports

---

Mandated reporters were more often in the occupations of peace officer/law enforcement official, school principal/official or social worker.

### Reporters of Child Abuse/Neglect during FY 2021 by Occupation

	Number	Percent
Permissive	15,784	24.0%
Peace Officer or Law Enforcement Official	10,048	15.3%
Principal or other school official	8,350	12.7%
Social worker	8,022	12.2%
Mental Health Professional	5,224	7.9%
Nurse	3,709	5.6%
Teacher	3,683	5.6%
Unknown	2,585	3.9%
Other Person with Responsibility for Care of Children	2,564	3.9%
Children's Division Worker	1,602	2.4%
Physician	852	1.3%
Juvenile Officer	625	1.0%
Other Health Practitioner	618	0.9%
Day Care	501	0.8%
Other Hospital/Clinic Personnel	405	0.6%
Psychologist	306	0.5%
Intern	198	0.3%
Probation Officer or Parole Officer	142	0.2%
Medical Examiner	138	0.2%
Minister	128	0.2%
Resident	120	0.2%
Dentist/Dental hygienist	45	0.1%
Jail/Detention Personnel	43	0.1%
Coroner	42	0.1%
Volunteer/personnel of community service program	30	0.0%
Optometrist	4	0.0%
Podiatrist	1	0.0%
Chiropractor	1	0.0%

**Note:** Reporters exceed reports because more than one person may report an incident.

---

## ***Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations***


---

Missouri's Child Protection Services system culminated from a collaborative effort between the Children's Division, elected officials, community organizations and private citizens. Its primary focus is to protect children from abuse/neglect in the least disruptive and intrusive way while recognizing the value of the family. In addition, the child's protection is provided in the most efficient and effective manner possible within the framework of state, community, and family resources.

A child abuse/neglect report is screened to determine the appropriate intervention method at the time the report is received by the CANHU. If behaviors that constitute a criminal violation are indicated, the response to the report is a fact-finding investigation and the appropriate local law enforcement agency is notified to assist. The response for remaining reports is a Family Assessment or a Juvenile Assessment for reports of children with problem sexual behavior. The main purpose of an assessment is to determine the child's safety and the family's need for services. Both investigated families and those who receive the assessment response receive prompt and effective delivery of services in order to address their needs.

Of the reports received in FY 2021, fifty-eight percent (58.2%) were initially assigned as Family Assessments, four percent (4.3%) as Juvenile Assessments, and thirty-seven percent (37.5%) as Investigations by the CANHU.

**FY 2021 Reports by Type of Response**



After the Children's Division worker has made contact with the reported family, or when law enforcement is involved and calls a worker into the field, a report initially assigned as an assessment may change its track to an investigation, or an investigation may be changed to an assessment track.


In May 2018, CD policy was changed to allow for reports to be tracked as Differential Response (DR) assessments. DR assessments are assessments that have been determined by the family, CD worker and supervisor as needing more intensive work with the family, and traditionally go beyond the 45 days to complete. Its purpose is to provide the family with needed resources, support and services to further promote safety and well-being of the family during the assessment period.

---

## ***Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations***

---

Over half of reports (57.9%) were tracked as Family Assessments and over one-third (37.3%) as Investigations. Less than one percent (0.5%) of reports were changed to Differential Response after assignment.



Children's Service Workers investigate/assess each report to determine if abuse/neglect is occurring or has occurred and evaluate the family's need for services. Thorough investigations/assessments require hours of interviews and information collection, and usually include the following major steps.

- Contacting the reporter, if known, for additional information before proceeding with the investigation;
- Contacting appropriate law enforcement personnel or multidisciplinary team members to request a co-investigation if the alleged report, if true, would constitute a violation of the law;
- Making a determination regarding the safety of the children within 24 hours, or immediately if deemed as an emergency;
- Contacting the School District Liaison when the victim in the child abuse/neglect report is school-aged;
- Determining the safety of all other children in the household within 72 hours;
- Consulting with the Chief Investigator within 72 hours;
- Contacting collateral persons;
- Interviewing witnesses;
- Interviewing the non-offending parent;
- Interviewing the alleged perpetrator(s);
- Evaluating and documenting all information collected and observed;
- Determining whether abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring;
- Evaluating the family's need for services and making appropriate referrals for needed services;
- Notifying the child's parent(s), alleged perpetrator and, if applicable, school district liaison and the mandated reporter of the report conclusion and related findings.

---

## ***Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations***

---

### **Observed Family Characteristics**

Children's Service Workers may designate up to fifteen **Observed Family Characteristics** during each family assessment/investigation. Services and supports for families are designed to build on the strengths and resources of the families and communities.

A third of reported families tracked as an assessment had adequate living conditions (36.8%) and extended family support systems (36.0%). Following are the top 25 observed characteristics.

#### **Characteristics of Families Involved in Family Assessments during FY 2021**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Adequate Living Conditions	12,582	36.8%
Extended Family Support System	12,312	36.0%
Amenable to Services	7,145	20.9%
Single Parent Household	6,777	19.8%
Community/Cultural Support	6,633	19.4%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	4,979	14.6%
Problem Solving Skills	4,801	14.1%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	4,435	13.0%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	3,792	11.1%
Good Physical/Mental Health	2,554	7.5%
No History of Violence	2,474	7.2%
Manages Finances Well	2,218	6.5%
Stable Marriage	1,786	5.2%
Other Drug Related Problems	1,139	3.3%
Domestic Violence	1,066	3.1%
Positive Childhood Experiences	1,031	3.0%
Lack of Parenting Skills	911	2.7%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	604	1.8%
Heavy Continuous Childcare Responsibility	577	1.7%
New Baby in Home/Pregnancy	556	1.6%
Crowded Living Conditions	536	1.6%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	518	1.5%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	449	1.3%
Marital Problems	444	1.3%
Alcohol Related Problems	370	1.1%

**Percent is the percentage of 34,167 reports tracked as Family Assessments, Juvenile Assessments or Differential Response. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.**

---

## ***Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations***

---

The characteristics of reported families involved in investigations are similar to families assessed. Around a third of families had extended family support systems (35.0%) and adequate living conditions (33.0%). Below are the top 25 observed characteristics.

### **Characteristics of Families Involved in Investigations during FY 2021**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Extended family support system	7,126	35.0%
Adequate living conditions	6,711	33.0%
Amenable to Services	3,912	19.2%
Community/Cultural support	3,616	17.8%
Single parent household	3,514	17.3%
Appropriate parenting skills	2,663	13.1%
Problem solving skills	2,408	11.8%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	2,341	11.5%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	2,055	10.1%
Good physical/mental health	1,301	6.4%
Manages finances well	1,203	5.9%
No History of Violence	1,145	5.6%
Stable Marriage	999	4.9%
Other drug related problem(s)	961	4.7%
Lack of Parenting Skills	854	4.2%
Domestic Violence	759	3.7%
Positive childhood experiences	548	2.7%
New baby in home/pregnancy	386	1.9%
Heavy continuous child care responsibility	345	1.7%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	338	1.7%
Recent Loss/Addition to Household Members	308	1.5%
Dangerous Living Conditions	302	1.5%
Marital Problems	291	1.4%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	287	1.4%
Crowded Living Conditions	277	1.4%

**Percent is the percentage of 20,348 reports tracked as Investigations. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to 15 family characteristics may be reported for each Family Assessment.**

---

## Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

---

Unless there is good cause, investigations/assessments should be closed within 45 days. Juvenile assessments and DR assessments are usually completed within 90 days. Upon completion of the investigation, a report may be concluded as Substantiated, Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated (PSI), Unsubstantiated, or Family Assessment.

**Substantiated:** A finding that a preponderance of evidence exists to conclude abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring as a result of the observation of visible signs, physical and/or credible verbal evidence provided to the Children's Service Worker by the child, perpetrator or witnesses in accordance with the definitions of abuse/neglect. This includes cases which are adjudicated by the courts.

**Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated:** A finding that insufficient visible signs, physical and/or credible evidence exist, but where the Children's Service Worker determines that indicators are present which, if unresolved, could potentially contribute to child abuse/neglect.

**Unsubstantiated:** A finding that insufficient physical or credible verbal evidence exists and where few or no indicators are identified and the Children's Service Worker has not identified a specific threat exists for the child.

Conclusions categorized as Other include unable to locate, inappropriate report, located out of state, home schooling, already investigated, and school investigation by school board. See Appendix J for further definition.

### Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion

Six percent of incidents (6.4%) and of children (6.1%) were concluded as substantiated, consistent with past years.

#### Reported Incidents of CA/N by Conclusion


Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family, Juvenile, DR Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2017	3,621	5.3%	2,466	3.6%	17,202	25.3%	40,155	59.0%	4,570	6.7%	68,014
2018	4,097	5.5%	2,136	2.9%	17,535	23.7%	46,848	63.4%	3,308	4.5%	73,924
2019	3,819	5.9%	1,677	2.6%	15,207	23.4%	40,775	62.8%	3,442	5.3%	64,920
2020	3,466	6.2%	1,563	2.8%	13,730	24.6%	34,890	62.5%	2,204	3.9%	55,853
2021	3,473	6.4%	1,512	2.8%	14,138	25.9%	32,993	60.5%	2,399	4.4%	54,515

# Child Protection System: Assessments & Investigations

## Reported Children of CA/N by Conclusion

Year	Substantiated		Unsubstantiated PSI		Unsubstantiated		Family, Juvenile, DR Assessment		Other		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2017	5,141	5.2%	3,718	3.8%	23,975	24.4%	58,879	59.9%	6,557	6.7%	98,270
2018	5,633	5.3%	3,126	2.9%	23,836	22.5%	68,673	64.7%	4,822	4.5%	106,090
2019	5,225	5.8%	2,453	2.7%	19,889	22.2%	57,303	63.9%	4,868	5.4%	89,738
2020	4,736	6.0%	2,253	2.9%	18,155	23.2%	49,964	63.8%	3,220	4.1%	78,328
2021	4,688	6.1%	2,168	2.8%	18,997	24.6%	47,613	61.7%	3,642	4.7%	77,108

## Reported Incidents and Children by Conclusion



Conclusions are as follows:

- Substantiated - Court Adjudicated and Preponderance of Evidence;
- Unsub.-PSI - Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated;
- Unsub. - Unsubstantiated;
- Assessment: Agency Responded Refer to FCS or AC Case Opened, Agency Responded No Concerns Found, Family Uncooperative Child Safe, Agency Responded Services Provided, Family Declined Services Child Safe, and Agency Responded Concerns Addressed;
- Other - Unable to Locate, Inappropriate Report, Located Out of State, Already Investigated, and Home Schooling



## Assessment Conclusions

The majority of CANHU reports were concluded as assessments. The goal of this approach is to assure child safety, address the strengths of the family, and to identify and treat the family's needs.

Family Assessments, Juvenile Assessments and Differential Response are concluded as the agency responded and either provided services, addressed concerns, or no concerns were found; or where the child is safe but the family refused services or refused to participate in the assessment process.

### Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion

The majority of Family Assessments and Juvenile Assessments were concluded as concerns addressed or no concerns found. Most Differential Response Assessments were concluded as concerned addressed but had a higher percentage of providing services or referred to Family Centered Services (FCS)/Alternative Care (AC) case opened.

#### Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2021


Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Differential Response		Total Assessments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	2,308	7.6%	79	3.5%	48	19.0%	2,435	7.4%
Agency Responded Services Provided	899	2.9%	100	4.5%	44	17.5%	1,043	3.2%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	14,895	48.8%	1,444	64.5%	116	46.0%	16,455	49.9%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	10,555	34.6%	561	25.1%	21	8.3%	11,137	33.8%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	536	1.8%	10	0.4%	11	4.4%	557	1.7%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	1,309	4.3%	45	2.0%	12	4.8%	1,366	4.1%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>30,502</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,239</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>32,993</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

#### Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2021

Conclusion	Family Assessment		Juvenile Assessment		Differential Response		Total Assessments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened	3,652	8.2%	122	4.5%	70	18.1%	3,844	8.1%
Agency Responded Services Provided	1,356	3.0%	111	4.1%	75	19.4%	1,542	3.2%
Agency Responded Concerns Addressed	21,421	48.1%	1,732	64.2%	168	43.4%	23,321	49.0%
Agency Responded No Concerns Found	15,233	34.2%	661	24.5%	29	7.5%	15,923	33.4%
Family Declined Services, Child Safe	818	1.8%	11	0.4%	18	4.7%	847	1.8%
Family Uncooperative, Child Safe	2,049	4.6%	60	2.2%	27	7.0%	2,136	4.5%
<b>Total Assessment Conclusions</b>	<b>44,529</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,697</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>47,613</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## Assessment Conclusions

Reported Incidents and Children by Assessment Conclusion during FY 2021



For reports concluded as assessments during FY 2021, half were found to have concerns addressed (49.9%) and a third found no concerns (33.8%). Seven percent (7.4%) resulted in opening a Family Centered Services (FCS) case or an Alternative Care (AC) case for 3,844 children, and three percent (3.3%) resulted in providing services for 1,542 children.

Reported Incidents by Assessment Conclusion

Year	Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Agency Responded Concerns Addressed		Agency Responded No Concerns Found		Family Declined Services Child Safe		Family Uncooperative Child Safe		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2017	3,668	9.1%	3,445	8.6%	NA		29,841	74.3%	1,224	3.0%	1,977	4.9%	40,155
2018	3,916	8.5%	3,587	7.8%	NA		34,836	75.7%	1,204	2.6%	2,478	5.4%	46,021
2019	2,508	6.2%	2,054	5.0%	16,686	40.9%	16,379	40.2%	784	1.9%	2,364	5.8%	40,775
2020	2,621	7.5%	1,294	3.7%	16,318	46.8%	12,311	35.3%	523	1.5%	1,823	5.2%	34,890
2021	2,435	7.4%	1,043	3.2%	16,455	49.9%	11,137	33.8%	557	1.7%	1,366	4.1%	32,993

## Assessment Conclusions


### Reported Children by Assessment Conclusion

Year	Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Agency Responded Concerns Addressed		Agency Responded No Concerns Found		Family Declined Services Child Safe		Family Uncooperative Child Safe		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2017	6,022	10.2%	4,980	8.5%	NA		43,113	73.2%	1,932	3.3%	2,832	4.8%	58,879
2018	6,379	9.5%	5,312	7.9%	NA		50,271	74.5%	1,876	2.8%	3,629	5.4%	67,467
2019	3,939	6.9%	2,957	5.2%	23,086	40.3%	22,804	39.8%	1,177	2.1%	3,340	5.8%	57,303
2020	4,164	8.3%	1,989	4.0%	22,806	45.6%	17,605	35.2%	800	1.6%	2,600	5.2%	49,964
2021	3,844	8.1%	1,542	3.2%	23,321	49.0%	15,923	33.4%	847	1.8%	2,136	4.5%	47,613

### Demographics of Assessment Children

During the year, 47,613 children were involved in reports concluded as assessments. Families with children age five and younger were somewhat more likely to be referred to Family Centered Services (FCS) or have an Alternative Case (AC) opened with Children's Division.

#### Children of Assessment Conclusions during FY 2021 by Age



## Assessment Conclusions

Children involved in reports concluded as assessments were split between males (49.4%) and females (50.5%). Nearly three-fourths were white (70.6%) and sixteen percent (16.5%) were black. Nine percent (9.0%) were of Hispanic origin.

### Assessment Concluded Children during FY 2021

	Assessments		Agency Responded Referred to FCS or AC Case Opened		Agency Responded Services Provided		Family Declined Services Needed Child Safe	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Total</b>	<b>47,613</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,844</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,542</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Age</b>								
< 1	2,204	4.6%	267	6.9%	86	5.6%	44	5.2%
1	2,271	4.8%	228	5.9%	70	4.5%	39	4.6%
2	2,477	5.2%	243	6.3%	90	5.8%	48	5.7%
3	2,581	5.4%	235	6.1%	76	4.9%	45	5.3%
4	2,645	5.6%	233	6.1%	76	4.9%	37	4.4%
5	3,014	6.3%	228	5.9%	80	5.2%	59	7.0%
6	3,146	6.6%	253	6.6%	108	7.0%	54	6.4%
7	3,125	6.6%	217	5.6%	86	5.6%	49	5.8%
8	3,080	6.5%	231	6.0%	102	6.6%	48	5.7%
9	2,879	6.0%	219	5.7%	87	5.6%	43	5.1%
10	2,745	5.8%	187	4.9%	92	6.0%	36	4.3%
11	2,767	5.8%	218	5.7%	90	5.8%	58	6.8%
12	2,867	6.0%	232	6.0%	98	6.4%	58	6.8%
13	2,952	6.2%	219	5.7%	94	6.1%	49	5.8%
14	2,823	5.9%	210	5.5%	108	7.0%	55	6.5%
15	2,504	5.3%	209	5.4%	92	6.0%	50	5.9%
16	2,257	4.7%	154	4.0%	72	4.7%	49	5.8%
17	1,221	2.6%	58	1.5%	34	2.2%	26	3.1%
Not available	55	0.1%	3	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
<b>Gender</b>								
Male	23,535	49.4%	1,926	50.1%	768	49.8%	414	48.9%
Female	24,040	50.5%	1,917	49.9%	773	50.1%	433	51.1%
Not available	38	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%
<b>Race</b>								
White	33,598	70.6%	2,911	75.7%	1,128	73.2%	565	66.7%
Black	7,878	16.5%	513	13.3%	258	16.7%	164	19.4%
Other/unknown	6,137	12.9%	420	10.9%	156	10.1%	118	13.9%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>								
Hispanic	4,286	9.0%	324	8.4%	147	9.5%	67	7.9%
Not Hispanic	38,605	81.1%	3,157	82.1%	1,256	81.5%	697	82.3%
Unknown	4,722	9.9%	363	9.4%	139	9.0%	83	9.8%

---


## Substantiated Conclusions

---

### Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

During FY 2021, 4,688 children were involved in incidents that were concluded as substantiated for abuse/neglect. When a Children's Service Worker determines there is preponderance of evidence that abuse/neglect has occurred, up to six categories of abuse/neglect can be assigned to each child. Neglect was the most prevalent category assigned during FY 2021 investigations.

**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2021**




**Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2021**

	Number	Percent
Neglect	2,520	53.8%
Physical Abuse	1,563	33.3%
Sexual Abuse	1,526	32.6%
Emotional Abuse	654	14.0%
Medical Neglect	135	2.9%
Educational Neglect	52	1.1%

Percent is the percentage of 4,688 total substantiated children. Percent total is greater than 100 because a child may be substantiated for up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

## Substantiated Conclusions

Most substantiated incidents were reported in March with 476 children. April saw the highest incidence of neglect (268), March saw the highest incidence of physical abuse (189) and sexual abuse (152). The lowest number of substantiated children was reported in November (288).



In addition to assigning categories of abuse or neglect, a Children's Service Worker may also describe up to fifty specific findings of abuse. For neglected children, the most frequent worker descriptions are those typically associated with neglect, such as a lack of supervision and unsafe or inadequate shelter. The ten most frequently reported worker findings for neglected children are shown below.

### Worker Findings for Neglected Children during FY 2021

	Number	Percent
Lack of Supervision	1,876	74.4%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	587	23.3%
Unsanitary Living Conditions	430	17.1%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	384	15.2%
Failure to Protect	319	12.7%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	280	11.1%
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	274	10.9%
Other Sexual Abuse	208	8.3%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	137	5.4%
Fondling/Touching	124	4.9%

Percent is the percentage of 2,520 substantiated neglected children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

For physically abused children, the most frequently reported worker findings were bruises, welts or red marks along with other abuse or injury. Lack of supervision was also cited quite often, suggesting that neglect may occur in some abusive situations. The ten most often reported worker findings for physically abused children are shown below.

### **Worker Findings for Physically Abused Children during FY 2021**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Bruises, Welts, Red Marks	847	55.5%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	739	48.4%
Lack of Supervision	468	30.7%
Abrasions, Lacerations	236	15.5%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	224	14.7%
Inappropriately Giving Drugs	202	13.2%
Failure to Protect	152	10.0%
Other Sexual Abuse	123	8.1%
Unsafe/Inadequate Shelter	116	7.6%
Unsanitary Living Conditions	87	5.7%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,563 substantiated physically abused children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.**

Other sexual abuse and fondling/touching were the most frequent worker findings for sexually abused children. Following are the ten most often reported worker findings for sexually abused children.

### **Worker Findings for Sexually Abused Children during FY 2021**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Other Sexual Abuse	914	58.5%
Fondling/Touching	780	49.9%
Intercourse	350	22.4%
Oral Sex, Sodomy	285	18.2%
Lack of Supervision	188	12.0%
Digital Penetration	188	12.0%
Pornography	108	6.9%
Blaming, Verbal Abuse, Threatening	104	6.7%
Failure to Protect	86	5.5%
Other Physical Abuse or Injury	82	5.2%

**Percent is the percentage of 1,526 substantiated sexually abused children. Percent total is greater than 100 because multiple findings may be found for a child.**

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

### **Observed Family Characteristics**

Information gathered during an investigation of child abuse/neglect can help identify factors which place a child at risk for abuse/neglect. In addition to establishing an investigative conclusion for each child, Children's Service Workers may designate up to four **Observed Family Characteristics** for each reported incident. These characteristics may indicate which services could help prevent the recurrence of abuse/neglect. It is important to note that these are not absolute counts. For instance, a problem with alcohol or other drugs may be difficult to detect during the course of an investigation.

The majority of families involved in substantiated incidents had an extended family support and adequate living conditions. The top twenty family characteristics are listed below.

#### **Characteristics of Families Involved in Substantiated Incidents during FY 2021**

	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Extended Family Support System	1,534	44.2%
Adequate Living Conditions	1,064	30.6%
Amenable to Services	799	23.0%
Single Parent Household	737	21.2%
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	619	17.8%
Community/Cultural Support	597	17.2%
Lack of Parenting Skills	494	14.2%
Appropriate Parenting Skills	390	11.2%
Problem Solving Skills	359	10.3%
Domestic Violence	354	10.2%
Stable Family Relationships/Household	295	8.5%
Appropriate Child Development Knowledge	293	8.4%
Dangerous Living Conditions	231	6.7%
Good Physical/Mental Health	180	5.2%
Manages Finances Well	170	4.9%
No History of Violence	165	4.8%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	164	4.7%
Stable Marriage	136	3.9%
Recent/Frequent Relocation	126	3.6%
Insufficient/Misuse of Income	125	3.6%

**Percent is the percentage of 3,473 total substantiated incidents. Percent total is greater than 100 because up to four family characteristics may be reported per incident.**



## Substantiated Conclusions

### Demographics of Substantiated Children

Of the substantiated children during FY 2021, over half (58.2%) were female and forty-two percent (41.8%) were male. Sexually abused children were more likely to be female. Neglect was more prevalent among younger children while sexual abuse occurred more often among older children.

#### Child Abuse/Neglect Children during FY 2021 by Category of Abuse

	Substantiated		Neglect		Physical Abuse		Sexual Abuse		Emotional Abuse		Medical Neglect		Educational Neglect	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
<b>Total</b>	4,688	100.0%	2,520	100.0%	1,563	100.0%	1,526	100.0%	654	100.0%	135	100.0%	52	100.0%
<b>Age</b>														
< 1	385	8.2%	303	12.0%	181	11.6%	0	0.0%	38	5.8%	25	18.5%	0	0.0%
1	287	6.1%	235	9.3%	100	6.4%	5	0.3%	30	4.6%	13	9.6%	0	0.0%
2	245	5.2%	193	7.7%	68	4.4%	13	0.9%	28	4.3%	8	5.9%	0	0.0%
3	262	5.6%	193	7.7%	99	6.3%	24	1.6%	17	2.6%	8	5.9%	0	0.0%
4	276	5.9%	188	7.5%	90	5.8%	49	3.2%	28	4.3%	10	7.4%	1	1.9%
5	252	5.4%	154	6.1%	82	5.2%	71	4.7%	29	4.4%	4	3.0%	1	1.9%
6	205	4.4%	119	4.7%	68	4.4%	48	3.1%	30	4.6%	3	2.2%	5	9.6%
7	215	4.6%	134	5.3%	66	4.2%	45	2.9%	33	5.0%	3	2.2%	4	7.7%
8	220	4.7%	118	4.7%	78	5.0%	63	4.1%	37	5.7%	2	1.5%	5	9.6%
9	216	4.6%	108	4.3%	66	4.2%	67	4.4%	41	6.3%	7	5.2%	3	5.8%
10	240	5.1%	112	4.4%	68	4.4%	99	6.5%	44	6.7%	7	5.2%	5	9.6%
11	262	5.6%	113	4.5%	75	4.8%	112	7.3%	60	9.2%	4	3.0%	4	7.7%
12	268	5.7%	113	4.5%	77	4.9%	134	8.8%	36	5.5%	8	5.9%	4	7.7%
13	323	6.9%	116	4.6%	94	6.0%	180	11.8%	48	7.3%	11	8.1%	8	15.4%
14	352	7.5%	104	4.1%	121	7.7%	209	13.7%	52	8.0%	5	3.7%	6	11.5%
15	277	5.9%	106	4.2%	103	6.6%	153	10.0%	45	6.9%	6	4.4%	3	5.8%
16	253	5.4%	76	3.0%	88	5.6%	145	9.5%	43	6.6%	7	5.2%	2	3.8%
17	150	3.2%	35	1.4%	39	2.5%	109	7.1%	15	2.3%	4	3.0%	1	1.9%
<b>Gender</b>														
Male	1,958	41.8%	1,260	50.0%	849	54.3%	208	13.6%	290	44.3%	63	46.7%	28	53.8%
Female	2,730	58.2%	1,260	50.0%	714	45.7%	1,318	86.4%	364	55.7%	72	53.3%	24	46.2%
<b>Race</b>														
White	3,338	71.2%	1,783	70.8%	1,081	69.2%	1,163	76.2%	461	70.5%	97	71.9%	34	65.4%
Black	747	15.9%	377	15.0%	288	18.4%	216	14.2%	127	19.4%	26	19.3%	13	25.0%
Other/Unknown	603	12.9%	360	14.3%	194	12.4%	147	9.6%	66	10.1%	12	8.9%	5	9.6%
<b>Hispanic Origin</b>														
Hispanic	422	9.0%	183	7.3%	131	8.4%	161	10.6%	64	9.8%	10	7.4%	10	19.2%
Not Hispanic	3,812	81.3%	2,053	81.5%	1,295	82.9%	1,243	81.5%	529	80.9%	112	83.0%	33	63.5%
Unknown	454	9.7%	284	11.3%	137	8.8%	122	8.0%	61	9.3%	13	9.6%	9	17.3%

---

## ***Substantiated Conclusions***

---

### **Child Abuse/Neglect Fatalities**


Missouri has a strong capacity to become aware of fatalities resulting from child abuse/neglect. If the medical examiner or coroner determines that the child died of natural causes while under medical care for an established natural disease, the coroner, medical examiner, or physician are required to notify the division of the child's death. In all other cases, the medical examiner or coroner accepts the report for investigation, immediately notifies the division of the child's death as required under section 58.452, RSMo, and reports the findings to the child fatality review panel established pursuant to section 210.192, RSMo.

Child Abuse and Neglect fatalities reported by the Children's Division include fatalities of children under the age of 18 for which a report of child abuse and neglect has been received by CANHU and which are classified as substantiated based on a Preponderance of the Evidence evidentiary standard of proof as stipulated in 210.110, RSMo.

In Missouri, there are three entities within state government responsible for child fatality information: Department of Health and Senior Services' Bureau of Vital Statistics, Department of Social Services Children's Division and the Child Fatality Review Program. All three exchange and match child fatality data in order to ensure accuracy throughout the system. However, the Bureau of Vital Statistics, Children's Division and the Child Fatality Review Program serve very different functions and, therefore, different classifications and timing periods apply, when child fatality data is reported. Therefore, totals included in this report may differ from totals reported by the other entities.

The number of fatalities reported during any given year may change as a result of pending investigations, changes in conclusions and deaths not reported in a timely manner. During fiscal year 2021, 65 children died as a result of child abuse/neglect.

The following chart represents the number of child fatalities for fiscal years 2017 to 2021, when abuse and/or neglect was associated with the child's death.




---

## Substantiated Conclusions

---

Types of abuse most often found to be substantiated in CA/N fatalities were neglect (67.7%) and physical abuse (31.9%).

**Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2021**



**Substantiated Fatalities by Category of Abuse/Neglect during FY 2021**

	Number	Percent
Neglect	44	67.7%
Physical Abuse	34	52.3%
Medical Neglect	2	3.1%
Emotional Abuse	2	3.1%
Sexual Abuse	1	1.5%

Percent is the percent of the 65 substantiated fatalities. Percent total is greater than 100 because a child may be substantiated for up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

## Substantiated Conclusions

Of the children involved in substantiated fatalities in FY 2021, the majority (56.9%) were two years old or younger. The highest incidence of child deaths occurred in December and March.


### Substantiated Fatalities during FY 2021

Age	Number	Percent
< 1	28	43.1%
1	6	9.2%
2	3	4.6%
3	1	1.5%
4	4	6.2%
5	2	3.1%
6	4	6.2%
8	1	1.5%
9	2	3.1%
10	3	4.6%
11	2	3.1%
12	3	4.6%
13	4	6.2%
14	1	1.5%
16	1	1.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	36	55.4%
Female	29	44.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	29	44.6%
Black	20	30.8%
Other	16	24.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Substantiated Fatalities by Month of Death during FY 2021



# Perpetrators

## Perpetrator Demographics

For FY 2021 substantiated reports, the majority of perpetrators were white, male and between ages 20 and 40.

### Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2021

Age	Number	Percent
<20	242	5.5%
20-29	1178	26.9%
30-39	1635	37.4%
40-49	685	15.7%
50-59	270	6.2%
60-69	132	3.0%
70+	41	0.9%
Unknown	189	4.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,372</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Race	Number	Percent
White	3,204	73.3%
Black	740	16.9%
Am. Indian/AK Native	5	0.1%
Asian	16	0.4%
Nat. Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	5	0.1%
Other/unknown	402	9.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,372</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	1,532	35.0%
Male	2,681	61.3%
Unknown	159	3.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,372</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident, and in more than one relationship type, during the report year. A natural parent and parent's partner accounted for the majority of both known alleged and substantiated perpetrators involved in an investigation or an assessment.

### Perpetrators by Relationship to Child during FY 2021

	Alleged Perpetrators	Substantiated Perpetrators	Percent Found Substantiated
Natural parent	78,478	3,287	4.2%
Parent/Caretaker's Partner	9,666	574	5.9%
Step-parent	6,177	331	5.4%
Grandparent	4,937	265	5.4%
Aunt/Uncle/Cousin (Also Great)	3,430	295	8.6%
Adoptive parent	1,649	49	3.0%
Friend	1,456	181	12.4%
Sibling/half, step-sibling	1,189	74	6.2%
Legal Guardian	1,216	35	2.9%
Institution/staff	842	74	8.8%
Foster parent	832	28	3.4%
Natural Child	802	40	5.0%
No Relationship Exists	674	48	7.1%
Alleged Father	551	29	5.3%
Day care provider	435	29	6.7%
Other Caregiver	426	30	8.2%
School/personnel	324	16	4.9%
Other relative	259	31	12.0%
Neighbor	238	42	17.6%
Putative Father	164	40	24.4%
Other	10,049	615	6.1%

---

## Perpetrators

---

### Observed Perpetrator Characteristics

Children's Service Workers may indicate up to four **Observed Perpetrator Characteristics** for each substantiated perpetrator of child abuse/neglect. These characteristics are used to assist in determining which services may be beneficial to a family. For instance, if perpetrators have unrealistic expectations of children, providing information on child development can help teach more appropriate disciplinary techniques.

The most prevalent perpetrator characteristic in FY 2021 investigations was drug related problem(s) (23.3%).

#### Characteristics of Substantiated Perpetrators during FY 2021

	Number	Percent
Other Drug Related Problem(s)	1,019	23.3%
No Apparent Mental/Emotional Disturbance	702	16.1%
History of Criminal Behavior	616	14.1%
Adequate Support System	529	12.1%
Mental/Emotional Disturbance	509	11.6%
Amenable to Services	358	8.2%
Unemployed	340	7.8%
Alcohol Related Problem(s)	314	7.2%
Pattern of Violent Behavior	308	7.0%
Undetermined	241	5.5%
Loss of Control During Discipline	235	5.4%
Unrealistic Expectations of Child	216	4.9%
Immaturity	197	4.5%
Parental History of Abuse/Neglect as a Child	193	4.4%
Financial Problems	187	4.3%
High School Education or Higher	127	2.9%
Low Self Esteem	112	2.6%
No One to Call on in Time of Crisis	81	1.9%
Institutional Report/Unknown Perpetrator	52	1.2%
Less than High School Education	27	0.6%
Illness	23	0.5%
Incapacity Due to Physical Handicap	15	0.3%
Mental Retardation	10	0.2%
Other	82	1.9%

Percentage is the percentage of 4,372 substantiated perpetrators. Percent total is greater than 100 because a worker may list up to four characteristics for each perpetrator.

## Prevention/Treatment Services

The Children's Division has several programs designed to provide treatment and to help prevent future occurrences of child abuse and neglect.

### Family-Centered Services (FCS)

FCS are provided to families and children in their own homes when a child abuse/neglect investigation has been concluded Substantiated, Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated or Family Assessment-Services Needed. These services are also provided to families who voluntarily seek help and to families whose children are placed out of the home. Services are provided following a family-centered assessment to identify risk issues, family strengths and service needs. A family treatment plan is developed with the family to help them change the conditions which brought them to the attention of CD. Services are designed to help the family direct their own affairs and provide suitable care for the children. The primary purpose of FCS is to improve and maintain the family unit or to reunify the family when alternative care services are provided. Services include a range of treatment and support services. The family treatment plan determines whether services are provided by CD staff and/or purchased or provided by community agencies. Purchased services include day care, family and/or individual counseling, home-based family-centered services, evaluation and diagnosis, homemaker services and respite care, among others.

During FY 2021, 102 of the 3,819 FCS cases opened were the result of a substantiated Child Abuse/Neglect report. Due to a policy change in March 2017, staff no longer open FCS functions on families when children are placed in alternative care.

**FCS Cases Opened**



**\*Other includes Family Requests Preventive Services, Court Order, Newborn Crisis Assessment, Family Assessment and Services Needed, and Pending Investigation/Assessment.**

### **Intensive In-Home Services (IIS)**

IIS is designed to prevent unnecessary out-of-home placement of children. An in-home specialist provides a variety of services to the entire family to address the crisis that would normally necessitate out-of-home care for a child. Services are delivered immediately at the time of crisis and are time-limited, usually four to six weeks. In-home specialists carry small caseloads of two families. This enables them to spend as much time with the family as needed. The emphasis of IIS is on strengthening the entire family by improving its problem-solving capabilities and teaching them necessary life skills. Among other services, families may receive family therapy, individual and marital counseling, parenting education, child development training, household maintenance and nutritional training, job readiness training and referrals to other community resources. Families authorized for IIS may have children who have been abused or neglected, have committed a status offense, have displayed delinquent behavior, or who are seriously emotionally disturbed and are at imminent risk of being removed from the home. This service is voluntary and at least one caretaker must be willing to participate.

### **Out-of-Home Placement**

Out-of-home care is provided in situations where a caregiver(s) is incapable of providing a child or children with adequate social, emotional and physical care. Out-of-home is defined as care provided in licensed foster or approved relative family homes or kinship care, in licensed residential facilities, or in licensed foster group homes. The service provides substitute settings for children. Children are placed only after it is determined that they cannot remain at home.

### **Child Care**

Assistance with child care services through payment of full or partial cost for eligible families is based on a sliding scale fee system. The primary purpose of the subsidized child care program is to enable families to obtain and retain employment, or the skills necessary to obtain employment, with the ultimate goal of breaking the cycle of poverty. Child care is to be considered an on-going benefit to the family's efforts of self-sufficiency. Additionally, protective services child care is available for children who are receiving preventive services or treatment for child abuse or neglect as part of the family's treatment plan.

### **Crisis Nurseries**

The first state-funded crisis nurseries began providing services to children and their families in May 1993. There are nine of these facilities. Crisis nurseries are child care facilities which protect children by providing a safe environment at a time when the chances of abuse/neglect in the home are increased. Parents voluntarily request and arrange this service directly with the crisis nursery.



---

## ***Prevention/Treatment Services***

---

### **Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board**

Children's Service Workers reach a conclusion on each child abuse/neglect investigation and notify the parents and alleged perpetrator (if different than the parents) by letter of the conclusion. In some investigations where the conclusion is substantiated, the alleged perpetrator may disagree with the finding. The alleged perpetrator may appeal to the Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board for review of the investigation by contacting the local CD office within 60 days of the notification of the finding. If there are pending criminal charges, the request may be made 60 days from the court's final disposition or dismissal of charges. If convicted, there is no appeal.

The Child Abuse/Neglect Review Board consists of six boards of nine private citizens appointed by the Governor. These boards each meet monthly to review child abuse/neglect appeals. They listen to testimony from CD staff, the alleged perpetrator, and representatives of the child and then decide to uphold or reverse the original CD decision. During FY 2021, the review board heard 518 cases and upheld almost eighty percent (78.8%) of the cases. Following the Child Abuse and Neglect Review Board's disposition, the alleged perpetrator has 60 days to request a judicial review.

### **Background Screening and Investigation Unit**

The Background Screening and Investigation Unit conducts background checks through the child abuse/neglect systems in CD. These checks are run on prospective foster and adoptive parents for CD and for current or prospective employees in the child care industry (day care, residential care providers, schools, etc.). The purpose of the unit is to provide information on potential employees so that a prospective employer can assess if the person is appropriate to care for children. The unit processed 50,501 background checks during FY 2021.

### **Calls from Reporters**

When a reported concern does not meet the criteria of a report of Child Abuse and Neglect (Investigation or Assessment), hotline staff document the concerns and, based on the topic of the call, provide referral contact information, as available, directly to the caller. In short, callers receive the referral contact information directly from the hotline worker rather than being contacted with it later by someone in the field. This immediate communication regarding available resources to the caller allows for a quicker referral to the family through collaboration with professional partners. This process provides assurance that local offices can respond in the most efficient manner possible to reports that meet the statutory definition of Child Abuse and Neglect. Reports received from reporters are referred to field staff if there is an open case on the family.

### **Newborn Crisis Assessments and Services**

CD collaborates with the Department of Health in conjunction with the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education through various workgroups and initiatives to address the increasing problem of substance abusing pregnant women and drug exposed infants. Missouri law requires the Departments of Health, Mental Health, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Social Services (CD) to provide a non-punitive system of educational and treatment services related to the prenatal consumption of alcohol and other drugs. On July 22, 2016, (P.L. 114-198) The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) established a comprehensive, coordinated, balanced strategy through enhanced grant programs that would expand prevention and education efforts while also promoting treatment and recovery. CARA amended sections of the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act (CAPTA) to remove the term “illegal” as applied to substance abuse affecting the identified infant and to specifically require that Plans of Safe Care address the needs of both infants and their families/caretakers.

In most instances, CD receives a Newborn Crisis Assessment, via the CA/N hotline, from the physician or health care provider, who requests CD to conduct an assessment to determine the caretaker's ability to care for an infant, or to provide protective services as directed by a physician. A physician or healthcare provider may also report non-drug related concerns about releasing a newborn from the hospital. Newborn Crisis Assessments are accepted until the child is one year of age if seen by a medical professional within the previous twenty-four hours of reporting.

In FY 2021, the Division received a total of 6,623 Newborn Crisis Assessments. Children reported to the Division for abuse and neglect are sometimes identified during the investigation process as having been exposed prenatally to drugs. In FY 2021, 358 children reported to CANHU were subsequently identified as drug-exposed.

# Appendices

## Appendix A: FY 2021 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	10	8.2%	1	0.8%	29	23.8%	81	66.4%	1	0.8%	122
	ATCHISON	4	9.8%	0	0.0%	11	26.8%	25	61.0%	1	2.4%	41
	BUCHANAN	80	6.1%	8	0.6%	345	26.5%	834	64.1%	35	2.7%	1,302
	CALDWELL	3	6.0%	4	8.0%	11	22.0%	32	64.0%	0	0.0%	50
	CARROLL	6	7.3%	0	0.0%	14	17.1%	61	74.4%	1	1.2%	82
	CASS	60	7.1%	10	1.2%	216	25.4%	554	65.2%	10	1.2%	850
	CHARITON	6	8.6%	5	7.1%	19	27.1%	40	57.1%	0	0.0%	70
	CLAY	69	4.0%	100	5.7%	429	24.6%	1,114	63.9%	32	1.8%	1,744
	CLINTON	11	5.8%	8	4.2%	44	23.2%	126	66.3%	1	0.5%	190
	COOPER	5	3.7%	3	2.2%	31	23.1%	81	60.4%	14	10.4%	134
	DAVISS	2	3.1%	7	10.9%	22	34.4%	32	50.0%	1	1.6%	64
	DE KALB	3	5.1%	1	1.7%	13	22.0%	39	66.1%	3	5.1%	59
	GENTRY	6	11.5%	0	0.0%	12	23.1%	33	63.5%	1	1.9%	52
	GRUNDY	11	7.9%	9	6.5%	27	19.4%	92	66.2%	0	0.0%	139
	HARRISON	7	6.4%	1	0.9%	15	13.6%	87	79.1%	0	0.0%	110
	HOLT	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	12	40.0%	16	53.3%	0	0.0%	30
	JOHNSON	25	6.2%	7	1.7%	120	29.6%	246	60.6%	8	2.0%	406
	LAFAYETTE	23	7.4%	11	3.5%	78	25.1%	197	63.3%	2	0.6%	311
	LINN	12	12.1%	7	7.1%	17	17.2%	63	63.6%	0	0.0%	99
	LIVINGSTON	8	6.6%	7	5.8%	33	27.3%	71	58.7%	2	1.7%	121
	MERCER	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	16	76.2%	1	4.8%	21
	NODAWAY	8	5.4%	1	0.7%	27	18.1%	113	75.8%	0	0.0%	149
	PETTIS	29	6.2%	8	1.7%	140	30.0%	257	55.2%	32	6.9%	466
	PLATTE	28	4.9%	7	1.2%	167	29.0%	356	61.9%	17	3.0%	575
	PUTNAM	5	8.2%	6	9.8%	7	11.5%	43	70.5%	0	0.0%	61
	RAY	18	8.0%	2	0.9%	52	23.1%	153	68.0%	0	0.0%	225
	SALINE	30	10.2%	7	2.4%	80	27.1%	171	58.0%	7	2.4%	295
	SULLIVAN	5	8.5%	7	11.9%	12	20.3%	35	59.3%	0	0.0%	59
	WORTH	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	7
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>1,985</b>	<b>25.3%</b>	<b>4,973</b>	<b>63.5%</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>7,834</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	32	12.6%	25	9.8%	33	13.0%	153	60.2%	11	4.3%	254
	AUDRAIN	22	7.8%	3	1.1%	58	20.6%	179	63.5%	20	7.1%	282
	BOONE	78	5.8%	42	3.1%	327	24.3%	853	63.3%	47	3.5%	1,347
	CALLAWAY	55	9.9%	14	2.5%	131	23.6%	338	60.8%	18	3.2%	556
	CLARK	11	12.8%	12	14.0%	7	8.1%	50	58.1%	6	7.0%	86
	COLE	35	6.0%	16	2.7%	146	25.0%	378	64.8%	8	1.4%	583
	FRANKLIN	46	4.8%	20	2.1%	200	20.8%	634	65.9%	62	6.4%	962
	GASCONADE	7	5.2%	5	3.7%	28	20.7%	91	67.4%	4	3.0%	135
	HOWARD	8	8.3%	1	1.0%	18	18.8%	63	65.6%	6	6.3%	96
	KNOX	6	20.0%	4	13.3%	3	10.0%	15	50.0%	2	6.7%	30
	LEWIS	10	9.2%	10	9.2%	22	20.2%	63	57.8%	4	3.7%	109
	LINCOLN	66	10.7%	13	2.1%	155	25.2%	373	60.6%	9	1.5%	616
	MACON	8	6.1%	3	2.3%	25	18.9%	95	72.0%	1	0.8%	132
	MARION	41	11.2%	19	5.2%	41	11.2%	244	66.5%	22	6.0%	367
	MONROE	8	9.4%	5	5.9%	16	18.8%	54	63.5%	2	2.4%	85
	MONTGOMERY	18	13.6%	3	2.3%	30	22.7%	73	55.3%	8	6.1%	132
	OSAGE	5	5.6%	3	3.3%	21	23.3%	55	61.1%	6	6.7%	90
	PIKE	26	15.5%	2	1.2%	41	24.4%	97	57.7%	2	1.2%	168
	RALLS	7	8.6%	1	1.2%	12	14.8%	53	65.4%	8	9.9%	81
	RANDOLPH	21	5.7%	4	1.1%	91	24.9%	235	64.2%	15	4.1%	366
	SCHUYLER	3	8.8%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	27	79.4%	0	0.0%	34
	SCOTLAND	8	20.0%	7	17.5%	2	5.0%	22	55.0%	1	2.5%	40
	SHELBY	8	13.3%	4	6.7%	12	20.0%	34	56.7%	2	3.3%	60
	ST CHARLES	189	9.4%	26	1.3%	449	22.4%	1,148	57.3%	193	9.6%	2,005
	WARREN	20	5.9%	14	4.1%	64	18.8%	225	66.2%	17	5.0%	340
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>1,933</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>5,552</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>8,956</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	15	11.3%	0	0.0%	17	12.8%	86	64.7%	15	11.3%	133
	BUTLER	57	9.9%	29	5.0%	165	28.6%	308	53.4%	18	3.1%	577
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	49	9.4%	5	1.0%	107	20.6%	333	64.2%	25	4.8%	519
	CARTER	5	7.4%	4	5.9%	19	27.9%	38	55.9%	2	2.9%	68
	CRAWFORD	26	9.7%	15	5.6%	53	19.8%	160	59.7%	14	5.2%	268
	DENT	18	10.9%	2	1.2%	35	21.2%	100	60.6%	10	6.1%	165
	DUNKLIN	21	5.6%	9	2.4%	107	28.6%	219	58.6%	18	4.8%	374

## Appendix A: FY 2021 Reported Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTANTIATED		UNSUB. PSI		UNSUB.		ASSESSMENT		OTHER		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	58	10.7%	35	6.5%	92	17.0%	344	63.7%	11	2.0%	540
	IRON	7	6.7%	1	1.0%	28	26.9%	65	62.5%	3	2.9%	104
	JEFFERSON	127	7.7%	94	5.7%	226	13.7%	1,149	69.8%	49	3.0%	1,645
	MADISON	18	12.9%	1	0.7%	33	23.6%	84	60.0%	4	2.9%	140
	MARIES	2	3.0%	8	12.1%	16	24.2%	40	60.6%	0	0.0%	66
	MISSISSIPPI	6	4.9%	0	0.0%	25	20.3%	91	74.0%	1	0.8%	123
	NEW MADRID	13	5.8%	11	4.9%	56	25.0%	139	62.1%	5	2.2%	224
	OREGON	15	11.0%	6	4.4%	27	19.9%	86	63.2%	2	1.5%	136
	PEMISCOT	13	6.7%	11	5.6%	45	23.1%	122	62.6%	4	2.1%	195
	PERRY	22	13.3%	4	2.4%	23	13.9%	106	63.9%	11	6.6%	166
	PHELPS	27	6.8%	13	3.3%	97	24.5%	242	61.1%	17	4.3%	396
	PULASKI	35	8.1%	26	6.0%	88	20.3%	268	61.9%	16	3.7%	433
	REYNOLDS	5	7.9%	3	4.8%	13	20.6%	41	65.1%	1	1.6%	63
	RIPLEY	20	12.8%	4	2.6%	32	20.5%	97	62.2%	3	1.9%	156
	SCOTT	20	5.1%	2	0.5%	89	22.8%	275	70.5%	4	1.0%	390
	SHANNON	12	14.3%	7	8.3%	20	23.8%	41	48.8%	4	4.8%	84
	ST FRANCOIS	70	8.6%	27	3.3%	189	23.2%	495	60.8%	33	4.1%	814
	STE GENEVIEVE	13	10.2%	10	7.8%	26	20.3%	75	58.6%	4	3.1%	128
	STODDARD	20	7.1%	6	2.1%	40	14.2%	207	73.4%	9	3.2%	282
	TEXAS	19	7.0%	18	6.6%	55	20.3%	169	62.4%	10	3.7%	271
	WASHINGTON	39	12.8%	7	2.3%	66	21.7%	184	60.5%	8	2.6%	304
	WAYNE	11	7.2%	7	4.6%	27	17.8%	104	68.4%	3	2.0%	152
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>1,816</b>	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>5,668</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>8,916</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	8	2.0%	13	3.3%	113	28.8%	246	62.8%	12	3.1%	392
	BARTON	13	8.0%	2	1.2%	40	24.5%	106	65.0%	2	1.2%	163
	BATES	8	4.7%	21	12.3%	33	19.3%	104	60.8%	5	2.9%	171
	BENTON	15	9.1%	25	15.2%	28	17.1%	92	56.1%	4	2.4%	164
	CAMDEN	25	6.0%	6	1.4%	97	23.2%	283	67.5%	8	1.9%	419
	CEDAR	13	8.0%	3	1.9%	42	25.9%	101	62.3%	3	1.9%	162
	CHRISTIAN	36	4.4%	13	1.6%	217	26.4%	546	66.3%	11	1.3%	823
	DADE	0	0.0%	2	3.7%	23	42.6%	29	53.7%	0	0.0%	54
	DALLAS	10	4.6%	1	0.5%	65	29.7%	141	64.4%	2	0.9%	219
	DOUGLAS	9	7.9%	6	5.3%	33	28.9%	64	56.1%	2	1.8%	114
	GREENE	161	4.3%	59	1.6%	943	25.2%	2,468	66.0%	108	2.9%	3,739
	HENRY	9	3.4%	12	4.5%	76	28.7%	159	60.0%	9	3.4%	265
	HICKORY	12	11.7%	8	7.8%	16	15.5%	65	63.1%	2	1.9%	103
	JASPER	72	4.5%	31	1.9%	431	26.8%	1,029	63.9%	47	2.9%	1,610
	LACLEDE	38	6.8%	21	3.8%	149	26.7%	344	61.6%	6	1.1%	558
	LAWRENCE	12	2.3%	10	1.9%	167	31.5%	335	63.1%	7	1.3%	531
	MCDONALD	10	4.3%	7	3.0%	68	29.6%	138	60.0%	7	3.0%	230
	MILLER	20	7.3%	15	5.5%	69	25.1%	168	61.1%	3	1.1%	275
	MONITEAU	1	0.9%	5	4.3%	25	21.7%	81	70.4%	3	2.6%	115
	MORGAN	18	8.1%	9	4.1%	43	19.4%	145	65.3%	7	3.2%	222
	NEWTON	20	3.8%	21	4.0%	138	26.2%	330	62.6%	18	3.4%	527
	OZARK	7	7.1%	5	5.1%	31	31.6%	53	54.1%	2	2.0%	98
	POLK	22	5.2%	6	1.4%	105	24.9%	280	66.4%	9	2.1%	422
	ST CLAIR	5	5.2%	2	2.1%	11	11.5%	73	76.0%	5	5.2%	96
	STONE	3	1.0%	4	1.4%	81	27.4%	200	67.6%	8	2.7%	296
	TANEY	59	8.1%	36	4.9%	147	20.2%	461	63.3%	25	3.4%	728
	VERNON	13	5.2%	3	1.2%	79	31.7%	146	58.6%	8	3.2%	249
	WEBSTER	34	7.6%	12	2.7%	109	24.3%	292	65.0%	2	0.4%	449
	WRIGHT	17	6.8%	5	2.0%	65	26.0%	159	63.6%	4	1.6%	250
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>3,444</b>	<b>25.6%</b>	<b>8,638</b>	<b>64.3%</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>13,444</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	276	4.3%	106	1.7%	1,977	31.1%	3,709	58.4%	284	4.5%	6,352
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>4.3%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1,977</b>	<b>31.1%</b>	<b>3,709</b>	<b>58.4%</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>6,352</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	174	7.1%	77	3.1%	605	24.7%	1,311	53.6%	280	11.4%	2,447
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	275	5.7%	113	2.3%	1,362	28.0%	2,749	56.6%	359	7.4%	4,858
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>26.9%</b>	<b>4,060</b>	<b>55.6%</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>7,305</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	98	6.3%	2	0.1%	1,016	65.8%	393	25.5%	35	2.3%	1,544
	OUT OF STATE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	164	100.0%	164
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>1,016</b>	<b>59.5%</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>23.0%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>1,708</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>3,473</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>14,138</b>	<b>25.9%</b>	<b>32,993</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>2,399</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>54,515</b>

## Appendix B: FY 2021 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTAN- TIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	ASSESS- MENT	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTAN- TIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	13	2	38	118	5	176	2.93	39.71
	ATCHISON	4	0	17	42	3	66	3.52	58.05
	BUCHANAN	105	8	455	1,257	47	1,872	5.62	100.28
	CALDWELL	4	4	12	55	0	75	1.96	36.73
	CARROLL	8	0	20	85	3	116	4.36	63.18
	CASS	73	13	277	742	15	1,120	2.79	42.80
	CHARITON	10	9	29	54	0	102	6.03	61.52
	CLAY	80	126	559	1,505	53	2,323	1.29	37.49
	CLINTON	12	8	57	173	3	253	2.42	51.07
	COOPER	5	7	46	119	19	196	1.31	51.48
	DAVIESS	3	11	37	45	2	98	1.38	45.00
	DE KALB	4	1	18	48	8	79	1.90	37.58
	GENTRY	13	0	17	50	1	81	8.30	51.69
	GRUNDY	17	17	39	146	0	219	6.94	89.39
	HARRISON	10	1	18	150	0	179	5.21	93.33
	HOLT	2	0	17	19	0	38	2.20	41.71
	JOHNSON	34	11	166	367	9	587	2.79	48.25
	LAFAYETTE	24	13	106	297	3	443	3.16	58.41
	LINN	15	10	26	87	0	138	5.43	49.93
	LIVINGSTON	10	8	40	103	2	163	3.24	52.85
	MERCER	8	0	2	21	2	33	9.86	40.69
	NODAWAY	9	4	36	182	1	232	2.12	54.76
	PETTIS	37	11	196	396	48	688	3.43	63.85
	PLATTE	35	8	218	473	22	756	1.37	29.62
	PUTNAM	5	14	10	60	0	89	4.88	86.83
	RAY	28	2	67	241	1	339	5.25	63.60
	SALINE	50	18	105	240	10	423	9.59	81.14
	SULLIVAN	9	12	16	54	0	91	6.43	65.00
	WORTH	1	0	0	5	1	7	2.45	17.16
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>2,644</b>	<b>7,134</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>10,982</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>50.35</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	49	34	41	216	13	353	10.09	72.72
	AUDRAIN	33	3	81	270	27	414	5.60	70.26
	BOONE	116	67	428	1,231	70	1,912	3.02	49.85
	CALLAWAY	81	22	166	477	27	773	8.49	80.98
	CLARK	18	17	8	71	13	127	11.47	80.94
	COLE	56	21	195	527	15	814	3.27	47.56
	FRANKLIN	57	30	262	904	88	1,341	2.41	56.81
	GASCONADE	10	12	50	125	5	202	3.22	65.12
	HOWARD	9	1	20	91	8	129	4.00	57.38
	KNOX	10	4	5	20	3	42	11.04	46.36
	LEWIS	19	11	31	94	9	164	8.92	76.96
	LINCOLN	95	19	199	537	16	866	6.25	57.01
	MACON	10	3	29	141	1	184	2.82	51.93
	MARION	61	25	54	354	29	523	9.24	79.23
	MONROE	10	5	19	67	3	104	5.12	53.28
	MONTGOMERY	21	8	35	108	13	185	8.49	74.78
	OSAGE	7	5	27	74	11	124	2.32	41.06
	PIKE	36	2	55	136	9	238	8.83	58.40
	RALLS	12	1	13	75	12	113	5.30	49.89
	RANDOLPH	29	4	127	353	23	536	5.48	101.23
	SCHUYLER	5	3	1	40	0	49	4.80	47.02
	SCOTLAND	11	12	3	32	1	59	7.83	41.99
	SHELBY	18	6	13	58	2	97	12.06	65.01
	ST CHARLES	260	42	578	1,572	261	2,713	2.75	28.67
	WARREN	25	19	76	307	22	449	3.02	54.27
	<b>*REGION TOTAL *</b>	<b>1,058</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>2,516</b>	<b>7,880</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>12,511</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>48.01</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	16	1	19	129	21	186	6.89	80.14
	BUTLER	86	48	228	465	36	863	8.75	87.77
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	74	15	137	474	35	735	4.25	42.21
	CARTER	9	4	29	53	3	98	7.96	86.65
	CRAWFORD	38	23	76	234	18	389	7.29	74.66
	DENT	23	2	53	151	12	241	7.24	75.88
	DUNKLIN	34	11	144	346	25	560	4.88	80.39

## Appendix B: FY 2021 Reported Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	SUBSTAN- TIATED	UNSUB. PSI	UNSUB.	ASSESS- MENT	OTHER	TOTAL CHILDREN	SUBSTAN- TIATED CHILDREN PER 1,000	TOTAL CHILDREN PER 1,000
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	90	48	115	502	15	770	9.50	81.32
	IRON	8	2	39	96	3	148	3.99	73.85
	JEFFERSON	163	124	294	1,667	73	2,321	3.11	44.30
	MADISON	24	1	40	119	5	189	8.34	65.67
	MARIES	4	9	21	63	0	97	2.19	53.09
	MISSISSIPPI	7	0	33	125	2	167	2.66	63.38
	NEW MADRID	18	13	78	223	9	341	4.62	87.57
	OREGON	19	7	38	133	5	202	10.05	106.82
	PEMISCOT	19	23	60	241	7	350	4.71	86.78
	PERRY	33	4	28	150	12	227	7.53	51.83
	PHELPS	37	19	129	371	25	581	4.05	63.53
	PULASKI	47	32	115	401	24	619	3.85	50.73
	REYNOLDS	9	4	26	66	4	109	6.89	83.46
	RIPLEY	24	8	48	139	5	224	10.05	93.80
	SCOTT	24	7	114	397	10	552	2.63	60.54
	SHANNON	25	8	34	60	4	131	16.29	85.34
	ST FRANCOIS	99	35	256	763	48	1,201	7.06	85.68
	STE GENEVIEVE	20	16	46	107	9	198	5.04	49.92
	STODDARD	34	6	56	308	14	418	5.28	64.93
	TEXAS	36	37	65	255	15	408	6.73	76.30
	WASHINGTON	49	11	101	286	12	459	9.39	87.93
	WAYNE	15	10	36	142	3	206	7.09	97.40
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,084</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>2,458</b>	<b>8,466</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>12,990</b>	<b>5.31</b>	<b>63.60</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	14	17	148	360	15	554	1.76	69.70
	BARTON	15	3	55	158	7	238	5.24	83.10
	BATES	11	26	45	153	6	241	3.00	65.74
	BENTON	21	42	40	132	6	241	6.04	69.29
	CAMDEN	39	8	123	414	9	593	5.00	76.04
	CEDAR	15	5	52	166	5	243	4.23	68.51
	CHRISTIAN	43	16	276	744	13	1,092	1.86	47.15
	DADE	0	6	30	41	1	78	0.00	48.36
	DALLAS	11	1	88	195	4	299	2.70	73.39
	DOUGLAS	15	8	44	98	2	167	5.99	66.69
	GREENE	212	80	1,208	3,495	161	5,156	3.45	83.88
	HENRY	13	23	89	247	11	383	2.68	78.82
	HICKORY	20	8	21	94	3	146	14.78	107.91
	JASPER	91	40	573	1,449	64	2,217	2.99	72.82
	LACLEDE	49	29	220	500	6	804	5.67	93.03
	LAWRENCE	15	11	222	483	10	741	1.56	77.28
	MCDONALD	13	13	88	197	8	319	2.12	52.05
	MILLER	26	21	107	270	4	428	4.45	73.31
	MONITEAU	1	9	37	126	4	177	0.25	44.86
	MORGAN	29	13	54	226	9	331	6.06	69.16
	NEWTON	29	38	194	486	35	782	2.09	56.23
	OZARK	10	7	51	111	6	185	6.23	115.19
	POLK	27	6	144	415	12	604	3.55	79.36
	ST CLAIR	7	2	16	105	6	136	3.55	68.90
	STONE	3	6	95	285	12	401	0.57	75.80
	TANEY	84	45	194	648	35	1,006	7.39	88.52
	VERNON	13	4	101	215	11	344	2.72	72.01
	WEBSTER	55	23	129	420	2	629	5.20	59.42
	WRIGHT	23	11	92	228	6	360	4.90	76.63
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>904</b>	<b>521</b>	<b>4,536</b>	<b>12,461</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>18,895</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>72.81</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	339	154	2,795	5,424	464	9,176	2.08	56.28
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>2,795</b>	<b>5,424</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>9,176</b>	<b>2.08</b>	<b>56.28</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	212	93	854	1,947	423	3,529	3.92	65.31
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	329	175	1,825	3,729	563	6,621	1.50	30.13
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>2,679</b>	<b>5,676</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>10,150</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>37.07</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	134	3	1,369	572	102	2,180	0.00	0.00
	OUT OF STATE	0	0	0	0	224	224	0.00	0.00
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1,369</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>2,404</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
STATE TOTAL		4,688	2,168	18,997	47,613	3,642	77,108	3.40	55.90

## Appendix C: FY 2021 Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	71	87.7%	10	12.3%	0	0.0%	81
	ATCHISON	25	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25
	BUCHANAN	774	92.8%	58	7.0%	2	0.2%	834
	CALDWELL	31	96.9%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	32
	CARROLL	50	82.0%	9	14.8%	2	3.3%	61
	CASS	505	91.2%	34	6.1%	15	2.7%	554
	CHARITON	37	92.5%	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	40
	CLAY	983	88.2%	98	8.8%	33	3.0%	1,114
	CLINTON	120	95.2%	1	0.8%	5	4.0%	126
	COOPER	74	91.4%	5	6.2%	2	2.5%	81
	DAVISS	32	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32
	DE KALB	36	92.3%	1	2.6%	2	5.1%	39
	GENTRY	26	78.8%	6	18.2%	1	3.0%	33
	GRUNDY	85	92.4%	2	2.2%	5	5.4%	92
	HARRISON	77	88.5%	6	6.9%	4	4.6%	87
	HOLT	14	87.5%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	16
	JOHNSON	223	90.7%	21	8.5%	2	0.8%	246
	LAFAYETTE	182	92.4%	14	7.1%	1	0.5%	197
	LINN	60	95.2%	3	4.8%	0	0.0%	63
	LIVINGSTON	64	90.1%	6	8.5%	1	1.4%	71
	MERCER	15	93.8%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	16
	NODAWAY	101	89.4%	12	10.6%	0	0.0%	113
	PETTIS	229	89.1%	17	6.6%	11	4.3%	257
	PLATTE	327	91.9%	24	6.7%	5	1.4%	356
	PUTNAM	38	88.4%	5	11.6%	0	0.0%	43
	RAY	137	89.5%	10	6.5%	6	3.9%	153
	SALINE	158	92.4%	7	4.1%	6	3.5%	171
	SULLIVAN	32	91.4%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	35
	WORTH	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>4,511</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>4,973</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	133	86.9%	15	9.8%	5	3.3%	153
	AUDRAIN	167	93.3%	9	5.0%	3	1.7%	179
	BOONE	786	92.1%	63	7.4%	4	0.5%	853
	CALLAWAY	310	91.7%	18	5.3%	10	3.0%	338
	CLARK	46	92.0%	4	8.0%	0	0.0%	50
	COLE	354	93.7%	24	6.3%	0	0.0%	378
	FRANKLIN	584	92.1%	41	6.5%	9	1.4%	634
	GASCONADE	85	93.4%	6	6.6%	0	0.0%	91
	HOWARD	58	92.1%	5	7.9%	0	0.0%	63
	KNOX	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	15
	LEWIS	57	90.5%	6	9.5%	0	0.0%	63
	LINCOLN	343	92.0%	28	7.5%	2	0.5%	373
	MACON	89	93.7%	6	6.3%	0	0.0%	95
	MARION	219	89.8%	21	8.6%	4	1.6%	244
	MONROE	49	90.7%	5	9.3%	0	0.0%	54
	MONTGOMERY	67	91.8%	3	4.1%	3	4.1%	73
	OSAGE	49	89.1%	6	10.9%	0	0.0%	55
	PIKE	88	90.7%	9	9.3%	0	0.0%	97
	RALLS	47	88.7%	6	11.3%	0	0.0%	53
	RANDOLPH	216	91.9%	19	8.1%	0	0.0%	235
	SCHUYLER	23	85.2%	4	14.8%	0	0.0%	27
	SCOTLAND	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%	22
	SHELBY	33	97.1%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	34
	ST CHARLES	1,052	91.6%	96	8.4%	0	0.0%	1,148
	WARREN	210	93.3%	13	5.8%	2	0.9%	225
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,099</b>	<b>91.8%</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>5,552</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	83	96.5%	3	3.5%	0	0.0%	86
	BUTLER	285	92.5%	23	7.5%	0	0.0%	308
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	303	91.0%	30	9.0%	0	0.0%	333
	CARTER	35	92.1%	3	7.9%	0	0.0%	38
	CRAWFORD	149	93.1%	11	6.9%	0	0.0%	160
	DENT	92	92.0%	8	8.0%	0	0.0%	100
	DUNKLIN	211	96.3%	7	3.2%	1	0.5%	219



## Appendix C: FY 2021 Assessment Conclusion Incidents by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	315	91.6%	28	8.1%	1	0.3%	344
	IRON	62	95.4%	3	4.6%	0	0.0%	65
	JEFFERSON	1,090	94.9%	59	5.1%	0	0.0%	1,149
	MADISON	80	95.2%	4	4.8%	0	0.0%	84
	MARIES	39	97.5%	0	0.0%	1	2.5%	40
	MISSISSIPPI	84	92.3%	7	7.7%	0	0.0%	91
	NEW MADRID	133	95.7%	6	4.3%	0	0.0%	139
	OREGON	77	89.5%	9	10.5%	0	0.0%	86
	PEMISCOT	118	96.7%	4	3.3%	0	0.0%	122
	PERRY	98	92.5%	8	7.5%	0	0.0%	106
	PHELPS	228	94.2%	14	5.8%	0	0.0%	242
	PULASKI	239	89.2%	29	10.8%	0	0.0%	268
	REYNOLDS	36	87.8%	5	12.2%	0	0.0%	41
	RIPLEY	91	93.8%	6	6.2%	0	0.0%	97
	SCOTT	261	94.9%	12	4.4%	2	0.7%	275
	SHANNON	40	97.6%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	41
	ST FRANCOIS	459	92.7%	36	7.3%	0	0.0%	495
	STE GENEVIEVE	70	93.3%	5	6.7%	0	0.0%	75
	STODDARD	189	91.3%	17	8.2%	1	0.5%	207
	TEXAS	156	92.3%	12	7.1%	1	0.6%	169
	WASHINGTON	176	95.7%	8	4.3%	0	0.0%	184
	WAYNE	92	88.5%	12	11.5%	0	0.0%	104
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,291</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>5,668</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	232	94.3%	14	5.7%	0	0.0%	246
	BARTON	102	96.2%	4	3.8%	0	0.0%	106
	BATES	98	94.2%	6	5.8%	0	0.0%	104
	BENTON	89	96.7%	3	3.3%	0	0.0%	92
	CAMDEN	264	93.3%	16	5.7%	3	1.1%	283
	CEDAR	87	86.1%	14	13.9%	0	0.0%	101
	CHRISTIAN	495	90.7%	50	9.2%	1	0.2%	546
	DADE	27	93.1%	2	6.9%	0	0.0%	29
	DALLAS	130	92.2%	11	7.8%	0	0.0%	141
	DOUGLAS	60	93.8%	4	6.3%	0	0.0%	64
	GREENE	2,284	92.5%	165	6.7%	19	0.8%	2,468
	HENRY	152	95.6%	7	4.4%	0	0.0%	159
	HICKORY	61	93.8%	4	6.2%	0	0.0%	65
	JASPER	962	93.5%	67	6.5%	0	0.0%	1,029
	LACLEDE	320	93.0%	21	6.1%	3	0.9%	344
	LAWRENCE	308	91.9%	27	8.1%	0	0.0%	335
	MCDONALD	133	96.4%	5	3.6%	0	0.0%	138
	MILLER	159	94.6%	8	4.8%	1	0.6%	168
	MONITEAU	72	88.9%	9	11.1%	0	0.0%	81
	MORGAN	132	91.0%	12	8.3%	1	0.7%	145
	NEWTON	306	92.7%	24	7.3%	0	0.0%	330
	OZARK	51	96.2%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	53
	POLK	263	93.9%	17	6.1%	0	0.0%	280
	ST CLAIR	71	97.3%	2	2.7%	0	0.0%	73
	STONE	185	92.5%	15	7.5%	0	0.0%	200
	TANEY	432	93.7%	29	6.3%	0	0.0%	461
	VERNON	143	97.9%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	146
	WEBSTER	251	86.0%	25	8.6%	16	5.5%	292
	WRIGHT	150	94.3%	9	5.7%	0	0.0%	159
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>8,019</b>	<b>92.8%</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>6.7%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>8,638</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	3,396	91.6%	258	7.0%	55	1.5%	3,709
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>3,396</b>	<b>91.6%</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>3,709</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	1,234	94.1%	77	5.9%	0	0.0%	1,311
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	2,559	93.1%	189	6.9%	1	0.0%	2,749
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>3,793</b>	<b>93.4%</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>4,060</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	393	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	393
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>393</b>
STATE TOTAL		30,502	92.4%	2,239	6.8%	252	0.8%	32,993

## Appendix D: FY 2021 Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	106	89.8%	12	10.2%	0	0.0%	118
	ATCHISON	42	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	42
	BUCHANAN	1,183	94.1%	68	5.4%	6	0.5%	1,257
	CALDWELL	54	98.2%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	55
	CARROLL	69	81.2%	13	15.3%	3	3.5%	85
	CASS	679	91.5%	37	5.0%	26	3.5%	742
	CHARITON	49	90.7%	5	9.3%	0	0.0%	54
	CLAY	1,335	88.7%	123	8.2%	47	3.1%	1,505
	CLINTON	166	96.0%	1	0.6%	6	3.5%	173
	COOPER	108	90.8%	5	4.2%	6	5.0%	119
	DAVIESS	45	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	45
	DE KALB	43	89.6%	1	2.1%	4	8.3%	48
	GENTRY	42	84.0%	7	14.0%	1	2.0%	50
	GRUNDY	134	91.8%	4	2.7%	8	5.5%	146
	HARRISON	137	91.3%	7	4.7%	6	4.0%	150
	HOLT	16	84.2%	3	15.8%	0	0.0%	19
	JOHNSON	338	92.1%	24	6.5%	5	1.4%	367
	LAFAYETTE	278	93.6%	18	6.1%	1	0.3%	297
	LINN	84	96.6%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	87
	LIVINGSTON	94	91.3%	7	6.8%	2	1.9%	103
	MERCER	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	21
	NODAWAY	166	91.2%	16	8.8%	0	0.0%	182
	PETTIS	357	90.2%	24	6.1%	15	3.8%	396
	PLATTE	438	92.6%	27	5.7%	8	1.7%	473
	PUTNAM	53	88.3%	7	11.7%	0	0.0%	60
	RAY	218	90.5%	12	5.0%	11	4.6%	241
	SALINE	222	92.5%	8	3.3%	10	4.2%	240
	SULLIVAN	51	94.4%	3	5.6%	0	0.0%	54
	WORTH	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>6,532</b>	<b>91.6%</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>7,134</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	192	88.9%	19	8.8%	5	2.3%	216
	AUDRAIN	258	95.6%	9	3.3%	3	1.1%	270
	BOONE	1,143	92.9%	83	6.7%	5	0.4%	1,231
	CALLAWAY	442	92.7%	20	4.2%	15	3.1%	477
	CLARK	67	94.4%	4	5.6%	0	0.0%	71
	COLE	501	95.1%	26	4.9%	0	0.0%	527
	FRANKLIN	848	93.8%	44	4.9%	12	1.3%	904
	GASCONADE	119	95.2%	6	4.8%	0	0.0%	125
	HOWARD	84	92.3%	7	7.7%	0	0.0%	91
	KNOX	19	95.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	20
	LEWIS	88	93.6%	6	6.4%	0	0.0%	94
	LINCOLN	503	93.7%	30	5.6%	4	0.7%	537
	MACON	133	94.3%	8	5.7%	0	0.0%	141
	MARION	325	91.8%	21	5.9%	8	2.3%	354
	MONROE	62	92.5%	5	7.5%	0	0.0%	67
	MONTGOMERY	101	93.5%	4	3.7%	3	2.8%	108
	OSAGE	66	89.2%	8	10.8%	0	0.0%	74
	PIKE	124	91.2%	12	8.8%	0	0.0%	136
	RALLS	68	90.7%	7	9.3%	0	0.0%	75
	RANDOLPH	330	93.5%	23	6.5%	0	0.0%	353
	SCHUYLER	36	90.0%	4	10.0%	0	0.0%	40
	SCOTLAND	30	93.8%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%	32
	SHELBY	57	98.3%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	58
	ST CHARLES	1,459	92.8%	113	7.2%	0	0.0%	1,572
	WARREN	288	93.8%	14	4.6%	5	1.6%	307
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7,343</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>7,880</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	125	96.9%	4	3.1%	0	0.0%	129
	BUTLER	438	94.2%	27	5.8%	0	0.0%	465
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	441	93.0%	33	7.0%	0	0.0%	474
	CARTER	49	92.5%	4	7.5%	0	0.0%	53
	CRAWFORD	219	93.6%	15	6.4%	0	0.0%	234
	DENT	140	92.7%	11	7.3%	0	0.0%	151
	DUNKLIN	335	96.8%	9	2.6%	2	0.6%	346

## Appendix D: FY 2021 Assessment Conclusion Children by Assessment Type

REGION	COUNTY	FAMILY ASSESSMENT		JUVENILE ASSESSMENT		DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE		TOTAL
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	463	92.2%	38	7.6%	1	0.2%	502
	IRON	93	96.9%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	96
	JEFFERSON	1,598	95.9%	69	4.1%	0	0.0%	1,667
	MADISON	115	96.6%	4	3.4%	0	0.0%	119
	MARIES	59	93.7%	0	0.0%	4	6.3%	63
	MISSISSIPPI	118	94.4%	7	5.6%	0	0.0%	125
	NEW MADRID	217	97.3%	6	2.7%	0	0.0%	223
	OREGON	118	88.7%	15	11.3%	0	0.0%	133
	PEMISCOT	237	98.3%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	241
	PERRY	141	94.0%	9	6.0%	0	0.0%	150
	PHELPS	356	96.0%	15	4.0%	0	0.0%	371
	PULASKI	361	90.0%	40	10.0%	0	0.0%	401
	REYNOLDS	59	89.4%	7	10.6%	0	0.0%	66
	RIPLEY	131	94.2%	8	5.8%	0	0.0%	139
	SCOTT	380	95.7%	14	3.5%	3	0.8%	397
	SHANNON	59	98.3%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	60
	ST FRANCOIS	719	94.2%	44	5.8%	0	0.0%	763
	STE GENEVIEVE	102	95.3%	5	4.7%	0	0.0%	107
	STODDARD	286	92.9%	20	6.5%	2	0.6%	308
	TEXAS	241	94.5%	13	5.1%	1	0.4%	255
	WASHINGTON	277	96.9%	9	3.1%	0	0.0%	286
	WAYNE	129	90.8%	13	9.2%	0	0.0%	142
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>8,006</b>	<b>94.6%</b>	<b>447</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>8,466</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	337	93.6%	23	6.4%	0	0.0%	360
	BARTON	153	96.8%	5	3.2%	0	0.0%	158
	BATES	147	96.1%	6	3.9%	0	0.0%	153
	BENTON	129	97.7%	3	2.3%	0	0.0%	132
	CAMDEN	392	94.7%	17	4.1%	5	1.2%	414
	CEDAR	146	88.0%	20	12.0%	0	0.0%	166
	CHRISTIAN	682	91.7%	60	8.1%	2	0.3%	744
	DADE	39	95.1%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	41
	DALLAS	184	94.4%	11	5.6%	0	0.0%	195
	DOUGLAS	94	95.9%	4	4.1%	0	0.0%	98
	GREENE	3,264	93.4%	200	5.7%	31	0.9%	3,495
	HENRY	238	96.4%	9	3.6%	0	0.0%	247
	HICKORY	90	95.7%	4	4.3%	0	0.0%	94
	JASPER	1,362	94.0%	87	6.0%	0	0.0%	1,449
	LACLEDE	467	93.4%	29	5.8%	4	0.8%	500
	LAWRENCE	453	93.8%	30	6.2%	0	0.0%	483
	MCDONALD	192	97.5%	5	2.5%	0	0.0%	197
	MILLER	257	95.2%	12	4.4%	1	0.4%	270
	MONITEAU	114	90.5%	12	9.5%	0	0.0%	126
	MORGAN	209	92.5%	15	6.6%	2	0.9%	226
	NEWTON	461	94.9%	25	5.1%	0	0.0%	486
	OZARK	109	98.2%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	111
	POLK	394	94.9%	21	5.1%	0	0.0%	415
	ST CLAIR	103	98.1%	2	1.9%	0	0.0%	105
	STONE	267	93.7%	18	6.3%	0	0.0%	285
	TANEY	614	94.8%	34	5.2%	0	0.0%	648
	VERNON	210	97.7%	5	2.3%	0	0.0%	215
	WEBSTER	368	87.6%	27	6.4%	25	6.0%	420
	WRIGHT	216	94.7%	12	5.3%	0	0.0%	228
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>11,691</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>12,461</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	5,036	92.8%	310	5.7%	78	1.4%	5,424
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,036</b>	<b>92.8%</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>5,424</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	1,837	94.4%	110	5.6%	0	0.0%	1,947
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	3,512	94.2%	216	5.8%	1	0.0%	3,729
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5,349</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>5,676</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	572	99.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	573
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>572</b>
STATE TOTAL		44,529	93.5%	2,697	5.7%	387	0.8%	47,613

## Appendix E: FY 2021 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED CHILD SAFE		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE		TOTAL
				SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED									
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	5	6.2%	3	3.7%	48	59.3%	19	23.5%	0	0.0%	6	7.4%	81
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	88.0%	3	12.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25
	BUCHANAN	18	2.2%	22	2.6%	507	60.8%	240	28.8%	6	0.7%	41	4.9%	834
	CALDWELL	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	8	25.0%	19	59.4%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%	32
	CARROLL	2	3.3%	1	1.6%	47	77.0%	8	13.1%	0	0.0%	3	4.9%	61
	CASS	21	3.8%	9	1.6%	231	41.7%	283	51.1%	2	0.4%	8	1.4%	554
	CHARITON	7	17.5%	2	5.0%	20	50.0%	6	15.0%	4	10.0%	1	2.5%	40
	CLAY	30	2.7%	23	2.1%	770	69.1%	247	22.2%	3	0.3%	41	3.7%	1,114
	CLINTON	9	7.1%	5	4.0%	30	23.8%	63	50.0%	14	11.1%	5	4.0%	126
	COOPER	9	11.1%	2	2.5%	16	19.8%	52	64.2%	0	0.0%	2	2.5%	81
	DAVISS	2	6.3%	1	3.1%	5	15.6%	24	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32
	DE KALB	2	5.1%	1	2.6%	9	23.1%	23	59.0%	1	2.6%	3	7.7%	39
	GENTRY	3	9.1%	1	3.0%	27	81.8%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33
	GRUNDY	13	14.1%	22	23.9%	42	45.7%	7	7.6%	6	6.5%	2	2.2%	92
	HARRISON	12	13.8%	21	24.1%	33	37.9%	19	21.8%	2	2.3%	0	0.0%	87
	HOLT	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	12	75.0%	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16
	JOHNSON	7	2.8%	3	1.2%	118	48.0%	115	46.7%	0	0.0%	3	1.2%	246
	LAFAYETTE	9	4.6%	2	1.0%	159	80.7%	24	12.2%	0	0.0%	3	1.5%	197
	LINN	13	20.6%	4	6.3%	35	55.6%	9	14.3%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	63
	LIVINGSTON	14	19.7%	0	0.0%	9	12.7%	45	63.4%	1	1.4%	2	2.8%	71
	MERCER	0	0.0%	4	25.0%	10	62.5%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16
	NODAWAY	12	10.6%	3	2.7%	85	75.2%	13	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	113
	PETTIS	22	8.6%	4	1.6%	91	35.4%	133	51.8%	5	1.9%	2	0.8%	257
	PLATTE	9	2.5%	6	1.7%	204	57.3%	130	36.5%	2	0.6%	5	1.4%	356
	PUTNAM	9	20.9%	9	20.9%	17	39.5%	6	14.0%	1	2.3%	1	2.3%	43
	RAY	4	2.6%	4	2.6%	98	64.1%	40	26.1%	1	0.7%	6	3.9%	153
	SALINE	15	8.8%	3	1.8%	100	58.5%	47	27.5%	0	0.0%	6	3.5%	171
	SULLIVAN	6	17.1%	2	5.7%	18	51.4%	8	22.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	35
	WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>2,775</b>	<b>55.8%</b>	<b>1,591</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>4,973</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	8	5.2%	20	13.1%	66	43.1%	37	24.2%	6	3.9%	16	10.5%	153
	AUDRAIN	8	4.5%	5	2.8%	113	63.1%	48	26.8%	4	2.2%	1	0.6%	179
	BOONE	103	12.1%	19	2.2%	316	37.0%	358	42.0%	31	3.6%	26	3.0%	853
	CALLAWAY	31	9.2%	6	1.8%	191	56.5%	97	28.7%	5	1.5%	8	2.4%	338
	CLARK	7	14.0%	23	46.0%	12	24.0%	8	16.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	50
	COLE	28	7.4%	2	0.5%	233	61.6%	109	28.8%	2	0.5%	4	1.1%	378
	FRANKLIN	51	8.0%	14	2.2%	199	31.4%	329	51.9%	3	0.5%	38	6.0%	634
	GASCONADE	15	16.5%	0	0.0%	59	64.8%	14	15.4%	0	0.0%	3	3.3%	91
	HOWARD	3	4.8%	1	1.6%	45	71.4%	14	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	63
	KNOX	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	6	40.0%	6	40.0%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	15
	LEWIS	6	9.5%	0	0.0%	26	41.3%	26	41.3%	4	6.3%	1	1.6%	63
	LINCOLN	24	6.4%	4	1.1%	169	45.3%	152	40.8%	6	1.6%	18	4.8%	373
	MACON	4	4.2%	10	10.5%	49	51.6%	29	30.5%	0	0.0%	3	3.2%	95
	MARION	5	2.0%	28	11.5%	75	30.7%	119	48.8%	7	2.9%	10	4.1%	244
	MONROE	9	16.7%	4	7.4%	21	38.9%	15	27.8%	1	1.9%	4	7.4%	54
	MONTGOMERY	7	9.6%	3	4.1%	45	61.6%	14	19.2%	3	4.1%	1	1.4%	73
	OSAGE	4	7.3%	0	0.0%	34	61.8%	15	27.3%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	55
	PIKE	9	9.3%	1	1.0%	44	45.4%	38	39.2%	3	3.1%	2	2.1%	97
	RALLS	7	13.2%	3	5.7%	23	43.4%	16	30.2%	2	3.8%	2	3.8%	53
	RANDOLPH	18	7.7%	8	3.4%	143	60.9%	60	25.5%	3	1.3%	3	1.3%	235
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	16	59.3%	5	18.5%	5	18.5%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	27
	SCOTLAND	3	13.6%	9	40.9%	4	18.2%	4	18.2%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%	22
	SHELBY	6	17.6%	3	8.8%	8	23.5%	15	44.1%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	34
	ST CHARLES	18	1.6%	22	1.9%	602	52.4%	422	36.8%	28	2.4%	56	4.9%	1,148
	WARREN	20	8.9%	9	4.0%	106	47.1%	84	37.3%	0	0.0%	6	2.7%	225
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>2,594</b>	<b>46.7%</b>	<b>2,034</b>	<b>36.6%</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>5,552</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	18	20.9%	2	2.3%	52	60.5%	8	9.3%	4	4.7%	2	2.3%	86
	BUTLER	26	8.4%	6	1.9%	184	59.7%	67	21.8%	10	3.2%	15	4.9%	308
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	92	27.6%	3	0.9%	174	52.3%	29	8.7%	19	5.7%	16	4.8%	333
	CARTER	8	21.1%	5	13.2%	12	31.6%	10	26.3%	1	2.6%	2	5.3%	38
	CRAWFORD	10	6.3%	0	0.0%	59	36.9%	85	53.1%	0	0.0%	6	3.8%	160
	DENT	8	8.0%	1	1.0%	47	47.0%	33	33.0%	1	1.0%	10	10.0%	100
	DUNKLIN	31	14.2%	2	0.9%	99	45.2%	86	39.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	219

## Appendix E: FY 2021 Assessment Incidents by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		AGENCY RESPONDED		CONCERNS ADDRESSED		NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE		TOTAL
				SERVICES PROVIDED						CHILD SAFE		CHILD SAFE		
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	43	12.5%	34	9.9%	157	45.6%	82	23.8%	3	0.9%	25	7.3%	344
	IRON	6	9.2%	0	0.0%	32	49.2%	27	41.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	65
	JEFFERSON	89	7.7%	26	2.3%	545	47.4%	357	31.1%	32	2.8%	100	8.7%	1,149
	MADISON	8	9.5%	1	1.2%	47	56.0%	25	29.8%	1	1.2%	2	2.4%	84
	MARIES	5	12.5%	0	0.0%	18	45.0%	11	27.5%	1	2.5%	5	12.5%	40
	MISSISSIPPI	15	16.5%	3	3.3%	46	50.5%	26	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	91
	NEW MADRID	24	17.3%	8	5.8%	63	45.3%	41	29.5%	1	0.7%	2	1.4%	139
	OREGON	10	11.6%	6	7.0%	50	58.1%	17	19.8%	0	0.0%	3	3.5%	86
	PEMISCOT	26	21.3%	2	1.6%	53	43.4%	41	33.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	122
	PERRY	25	23.6%	2	1.9%	54	50.9%	13	12.3%	11	10.4%	1	0.9%	106
	PHELPS	37	15.3%	4	1.7%	112	46.3%	55	22.7%	7	2.9%	27	11.2%	242
	PULASKI	30	11.2%	2	0.7%	157	58.6%	41	15.3%	6	2.2%	32	11.9%	268
	REYNOLDS	0	0.0%	2	4.9%	26	63.4%	11	26.8%	0	0.0%	2	4.9%	41
	RIPLEY	5	5.2%	3	3.1%	62	63.9%	17	17.5%	5	5.2%	5	5.2%	97
	SCOTT	35	12.7%	13	4.7%	117	42.5%	106	38.5%	2	0.7%	2	0.7%	275
	SHANNON	2	4.9%	6	14.6%	17	41.5%	13	31.7%	2	4.9%	1	2.4%	41
	ST FRANCOIS	46	9.3%	24	4.8%	174	35.2%	221	44.6%	6	1.2%	24	4.8%	495
	STE GENEVIEVE	3	4.0%	2	2.7%	28	37.3%	36	48.0%	2	2.7%	4	5.3%	75
	STODDARD	72	34.8%	3	1.4%	70	33.8%	60	29.0%	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	207
	TEXAS	25	14.8%	3	1.8%	58	34.3%	69	40.8%	1	0.6%	13	7.7%	169
	WASHINGTON	16	8.7%	11	6.0%	66	35.9%	82	44.6%	4	2.2%	5	2.7%	184
	WAYNE	17	16.3%	2	1.9%	40	38.5%	36	34.6%	0	0.0%	9	8.7%	104
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>2,619</b>	<b>46.2%</b>	<b>1,705</b>	<b>30.1%</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>5,668</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	17	6.9%	5	2.0%	116	47.2%	106	43.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.8%	246
	BARTON	3	2.8%	4	3.8%	52	49.1%	46	43.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	106
	BATES	5	4.8%	2	1.9%	73	70.2%	22	21.2%	0	0.0%	2	1.9%	104
	BENTON	9	9.8%	9	9.8%	31	33.7%	34	37.0%	5	5.4%	4	4.3%	92
	CAMDEN	8	2.8%	4	1.4%	166	58.7%	99	35.0%	2	0.7%	4	1.4%	283
	CEDAR	11	10.9%	1	1.0%	47	46.5%	39	38.6%	3	3.0%	0	0.0%	101
	CHRISTIAN	24	4.4%	11	2.0%	327	59.9%	150	27.5%	17	3.1%	17	3.1%	546
	DADE	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	17	58.6%	9	31.0%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	29
	DALLAS	6	4.3%	3	2.1%	77	54.6%	49	34.8%	1	0.7%	5	3.5%	141
	DOUGLAS	16	25.0%	1	1.6%	26	40.6%	21	32.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	64
	GREENE	187	7.6%	53	2.1%	1,504	60.9%	595	24.1%	46	1.9%	83	3.4%	2,468
	HENRY	12	7.5%	4	2.5%	95	59.7%	43	27.0%	2	1.3%	3	1.9%	159
	HICKORY	2	3.1%	1	1.5%	23	35.4%	30	46.2%	9	13.8%	0	0.0%	65
	JASPER	98	9.5%	40	3.9%	478	46.5%	398	38.7%	9	0.9%	6	0.6%	1,029
	LACLEDE	26	7.6%	7	2.0%	156	45.3%	149	43.3%	4	1.2%	2	0.6%	344
	LAWRENCE	20	6.0%	2	0.6%	149	44.5%	159	47.5%	0	0.0%	5	1.5%	335
	MCDONALD	12	8.7%	4	2.9%	73	52.9%	48	34.8%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	138
	MILLER	19	11.3%	0	0.0%	87	51.8%	52	31.0%	3	1.8%	7	4.2%	168
	MONITEAU	10	12.3%	3	3.7%	37	45.7%	28	34.6%	2	2.5%	1	1.2%	81
	MORGAN	18	12.4%	4	2.8%	66	45.5%	51	35.2%	3	2.1%	3	2.1%	145
	NEWTON	28	8.5%	10	3.0%	181	54.8%	105	31.8%	4	1.2%	2	0.6%	330
	OZARK	11	20.8%	3	5.7%	22	41.5%	17	32.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	53
	POLK	25	8.9%	9	3.2%	148	52.9%	86	30.7%	0	0.0%	12	4.3%	280
	ST CLAIR	7	9.6%	2	2.7%	31	42.5%	33	45.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	73
	STONE	12	6.0%	0	0.0%	107	53.5%	78	39.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.5%	200
	TANEY	41	8.9%	12	2.6%	188	40.8%	208	45.1%	4	0.9%	8	1.7%	461
	VERNON	13	8.9%	2	1.4%	76	52.1%	52	35.6%	1	0.7%	2	1.4%	146
	WEBSTER	29	9.9%	11	3.8%	72	24.7%	167	57.2%	5	1.7%	8	2.7%	292
	WRIGHT	22	13.8%	5	3.1%	71	44.7%	56	35.2%	1	0.6%	4	2.5%	159
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>692</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>4,496</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>2,930</b>	<b>33.9%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>8,638</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	218	5.9%	133	3.6%	1,846	49.8%	1,220	32.9%	27	0.7%	265	7.1%	3,709
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>1,220</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>3,709</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	56	4.3%	38	2.9%	728	55.5%	358	27.3%	31	2.4%	100	7.6%	1,311
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	79	2.9%	107	3.9%	1,272	46.3%	1,048	38.1%	91	3.3%	152	5.5%	2,749
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>49.3%</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>4,060</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	7	1.8%	8	2.0%	125	31.8%	251	63.9%	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	393
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>63.9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>393</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>2,435</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>1,043</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>16,455</b>	<b>49.9%</b>	<b>11,137</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1,366</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>32,993</b>

## Appendix F: FY 2021 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		AGENCY RESPONDED				NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED CHILD SAFE		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE CHILD SAFE		TOTAL
				SERVICES PROVIDED	CONCERNS ADDRESSED									
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	15	12.7%	8	6.8%	59	50.0%	26	22.0%	0	0.0%	10	8.5%	118
	ATCHISON	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	35	83.3%	7	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	42
	BUCHANAN	29	2.3%	29	2.3%	771	61.3%	344	27.4%	12	1.0%	72	5.7%	1,257
	CALDWELL	5	9.1%	0	0.0%	14	25.5%	33	60.0%	2	3.6%	1	1.8%	55
	CARROLL	3	3.5%	1	1.2%	63	74.1%	10	11.8%	0	0.0%	8	9.4%	85
	CASS	26	3.5%	20	2.7%	303	40.8%	380	51.2%	2	0.3%	11	1.5%	742
	CHARITON	13	24.1%	2	3.7%	23	42.6%	8	14.8%	4	7.4%	4	7.4%	54
	CLAY	41	2.7%	37	2.5%	1,024	68.0%	335	22.3%	5	0.3%	63	4.2%	1,505
	CLINTON	13	7.5%	10	5.8%	36	20.8%	87	50.3%	22	12.7%	5	2.9%	173
	COOPER	16	13.4%	4	3.4%	23	19.3%	70	58.8%	0	0.0%	6	5.0%	119
	DAVISS	2	4.4%	2	4.4%	5	11.1%	36	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	45
	DE KALB	5	10.4%	1	2.1%	12	25.0%	25	52.1%	2	4.2%	3	6.3%	48
	GENTRY	6	12.0%	1	2.0%	41	82.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	50
	GRUNDY	28	19.2%	34	23.3%	60	41.1%	9	6.2%	11	7.5%	4	2.7%	146
	HARRISON	20	13.3%	41	27.3%	54	36.0%	29	19.3%	6	4.0%	0	0.0%	150
	HOLT	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	15	78.9%	3	15.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19
	JOHNSON	10	2.7%	6	1.6%	161	43.9%	186	50.7%	0	0.0%	4	1.1%	367
	LAFAYETTE	21	7.1%	3	1.0%	224	75.4%	44	14.8%	0	0.0%	5	1.7%	297
	LINN	16	18.4%	9	10.3%	46	52.9%	14	16.1%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	87
	LIVINGSTON	18	17.5%	0	0.0%	12	11.7%	68	66.0%	3	2.9%	2	1.9%	103
	MERCER	0	0.0%	8	38.1%	11	52.4%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21
	NODAWAY	23	12.6%	3	1.6%	135	74.2%	21	11.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	182
	PETTIS	42	10.6%	4	1.0%	146	36.9%	194	49.0%	5	1.3%	5	1.3%	396
	PLATTE	11	2.3%	8	1.7%	278	58.8%	167	35.3%	4	0.8%	5	1.1%	473
	PUTNAM	9	15.0%	13	21.7%	27	45.0%	9	15.0%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	60
	RAY	10	4.1%	7	2.9%	141	58.5%	72	29.9%	3	1.2%	8	3.3%	241
	SALINE	21	8.8%	5	2.1%	134	55.8%	70	29.2%	0	0.0%	10	4.2%	240
	SULLIVAN	8	14.8%	4	7.4%	26	48.1%	14	25.9%	2	3.7%	0	0.0%	54
	WORTH	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>3,883</b>	<b>54.4%</b>	<b>2,266</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>7,134</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	13	6.0%	30	13.9%	91	42.1%	51	23.6%	6	2.8%	25	11.6%	216
	AUDRAIN	16	5.9%	5	1.9%	161	59.6%	82	30.4%	5	1.9%	1	0.4%	270
	BOONE	153	12.4%	24	1.9%	467	37.9%	507	41.2%	42	3.4%	38	3.1%	1,231
	CALLAWAY	43	9.0%	7	1.5%	276	57.9%	136	28.5%	5	1.0%	10	2.1%	477
	CLARK	12	16.9%	29	40.8%	19	26.8%	11	15.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	71
	COLE	43	8.2%	2	0.4%	326	61.9%	146	27.7%	2	0.4%	8	1.5%	527
	FRANKLIN	76	8.4%	20	2.2%	282	31.2%	454	50.2%	4	0.4%	68	7.5%	904
	GASCONADE	27	21.6%	0	0.0%	76	60.8%	19	15.2%	0	0.0%	3	2.4%	125
	HOWARD	6	6.6%	1	1.1%	63	69.2%	21	23.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	91
	KNOX	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	7	35.0%	9	45.0%	2	10.0%	1	5.0%	20
	LEWIS	12	12.8%	0	0.0%	34	36.2%	41	43.6%	6	6.4%	1	1.1%	94
	LINCOLN	44	8.2%	5	0.9%	236	43.9%	214	39.9%	9	1.7%	29	5.4%	537
	MACON	9	6.4%	16	11.3%	69	48.9%	41	29.1%	0	0.0%	6	4.3%	141
	MARION	13	3.7%	39	11.0%	110	31.1%	168	47.5%	9	2.5%	15	4.2%	354
	MONROE	13	19.4%	4	6.0%	26	38.8%	19	28.4%	1	1.5%	4	6.0%	67
	MONTGOMERY	8	7.4%	3	2.8%	74	68.5%	19	17.6%	3	2.8%	1	0.9%	108
	OSAGE	6	8.1%	0	0.0%	44	59.5%	22	29.7%	1	1.4%	1	1.4%	74
	PIKE	14	10.3%	2	1.5%	60	44.1%	54	39.7%	4	2.9%	2	1.5%	136
	RALLS	12	16.0%	3	4.0%	36	48.0%	19	25.3%	3	4.0%	2	2.7%	75
	RANDOLPH	25	7.1%	13	3.7%	195	55.2%	104	29.5%	10	2.8%	6	1.7%	353
	SCHUYLER	0	0.0%	22	55.0%	9	22.5%	8	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.5%	40
	SCOTLAND	4	12.5%	13	40.6%	7	21.9%	5	15.6%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%	32
	SHELBY	13	22.4%	5	8.6%	16	27.6%	22	37.9%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	58
	ST CHARLES	38	2.4%	35	2.2%	795	50.6%	574	36.5%	50	3.2%	80	5.1%	1,572
	WARREN	26	8.5%	15	4.9%	144	46.9%	112	36.5%	0	0.0%	10	3.3%	307
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>3.7%</b>	<b>3,623</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>2,858</b>	<b>36.3%</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>4.0%</b>	<b>7,880</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	34	26.4%	2	1.6%	73	56.6%	10	7.8%	4	3.1%	6	4.7%	129
	BUTLER	43	9.2%	8	1.7%	273	58.7%	99	21.3%	19	4.1%	23	4.9%	465
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	125	26.4%	3	0.6%	246	51.9%	36	7.6%	41	8.6%	23	4.9%	474
	CARTER	8	15.1%	6	11.3%	20	37.7%	13	24.5%	1	1.9%	5	9.4%	53
	CRAWFORD	14	6.0%	0	0.0%	83	35.5%	131	56.0%	0	0.0%	6	2.6%	234
	DENT	15	9.9%	1	0.7%	68	45.0%	46	30.5%	1	0.7%	20	13.2%	151
	DUNKLIN	53	15.3%	2	0.6%	149	43.1%	140	40.5%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	346

## Appendix F: FY 2021 Assessment Children by Conclusion

REGION	COUNTY	FCS REFER/ AC OPENED		AGENCY RESPONDED		CONCERNS ADDRESSED		NO CONCERNS FOUND		SERVICES DECLINED		FAMILY UNCOOPERATIVE		TOTAL
				SERVICES PROVIDED						CHILD SAFE		CHILD SAFE		
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	60	12.0%	45	9.0%	230	45.8%	118	23.5%	5	1.0%	44	8.8%	502
	IRON	6	6.3%	0	0.0%	44	45.8%	46	47.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	96
	JEFFERSON	154	9.2%	45	2.7%	787	47.2%	504	30.2%	39	2.3%	138	8.3%	1,667
	MADISON	9	7.6%	1	0.8%	71	59.7%	33	27.7%	3	2.5%	2	1.7%	119
	MARIES	6	9.5%	0	0.0%	30	47.6%	16	25.4%	4	6.3%	7	11.1%	63
	MISSISSIPPI	23	18.4%	3	2.4%	62	49.6%	35	28.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	125
	NEW MADRID	36	16.1%	17	7.6%	100	44.8%	64	28.7%	4	1.8%	2	0.9%	223
	OREGON	19	14.3%	9	6.8%	76	57.1%	24	18.0%	0	0.0%	5	3.8%	133
	PEMISCOT	51	21.2%	6	2.5%	95	39.4%	89	36.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	241
	PERRY	37	24.7%	2	1.3%	78	52.0%	16	10.7%	16	10.7%	1	0.7%	150
	PHELPS	69	18.6%	7	1.9%	168	45.3%	74	19.9%	9	2.4%	44	11.9%	371
	PULASKI	53	13.2%	3	0.7%	229	57.1%	61	15.2%	9	2.2%	46	11.5%	401
	REYNOLDS	0	0.0%	2	3.0%	45	68.2%	16	24.2%	0	0.0%	3	4.5%	66
	RIPLEY	8	5.8%	5	3.6%	83	59.7%	26	18.7%	10	7.2%	7	5.0%	139
	SCOTT	58	14.6%	16	4.0%	171	43.1%	144	36.3%	4	1.0%	4	1.0%	397
	SHANNON	3	5.0%	9	15.0%	26	43.3%	19	31.7%	2	3.3%	1	1.7%	60
	ST FRANCOIS	83	10.9%	33	4.3%	261	34.2%	337	44.2%	7	0.9%	42	5.5%	763
	STE GENEVIEVE	3	2.8%	4	3.7%	36	33.6%	56	52.3%	2	1.9%	6	5.6%	107
	STODDARD	116	37.7%	5	1.6%	111	36.0%	72	23.4%	4	1.3%	0	0.0%	308
	TEXAS	40	15.7%	8	3.1%	82	32.2%	103	40.4%	1	0.4%	21	8.2%	255
	WASHINGTON	20	7.0%	13	4.5%	104	36.4%	135	47.2%	7	2.4%	7	2.4%	286
	WAYNE	26	18.3%	3	2.1%	51	35.9%	50	35.2%	0	0.0%	12	8.5%	142
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,172</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>3,852</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>2,513</b>	<b>29.7%</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>8,466</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	25	6.9%	7	1.9%	170	47.2%	150	41.7%	0	0.0%	8	2.2%	360
	BARTON	3	1.9%	5	3.2%	72	45.6%	77	48.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	158
	BATES	8	5.2%	4	2.6%	107	69.9%	32	20.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.3%	153
	BENTON	16	12.1%	15	11.4%	43	32.6%	48	36.4%	6	4.5%	4	3.0%	132
	CAMDEN	17	4.1%	4	1.0%	233	56.3%	148	35.7%	3	0.7%	9	2.2%	414
	CEDAR	21	12.7%	2	1.2%	83	50.0%	55	33.1%	5	3.0%	0	0.0%	166
	CHRISTIAN	31	4.2%	15	2.0%	453	60.9%	194	26.1%	25	3.4%	26	3.5%	744
	DADE	3	7.3%	1	2.4%	21	51.2%	15	36.6%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	41
	DALLAS	13	6.7%	3	1.5%	109	55.9%	60	30.8%	1	0.5%	9	4.6%	195
	DOUGLAS	31	31.6%	1	1.0%	36	36.7%	30	30.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	98
	GREENE	294	8.4%	74	2.1%	2,092	59.9%	834	23.9%	73	2.1%	128	3.7%	3,495
	HENRY	20	8.1%	7	2.8%	134	54.3%	74	30.0%	4	1.6%	8	3.2%	247
	HICKORY	2	2.1%	1	1.1%	29	30.9%	48	51.1%	14	14.9%	0	0.0%	94
	JASPER	152	10.5%	55	3.8%	670	46.2%	548	37.8%	15	1.0%	9	0.6%	1,449
	LACLEDE	35	7.0%	11	2.2%	234	46.8%	212	42.4%	6	1.2%	2	0.4%	500
	LAWRENCE	27	5.6%	3	0.6%	219	45.3%	226	46.8%	0	0.0%	8	1.7%	483
	MCDONALD	20	10.2%	5	2.5%	103	52.3%	66	33.5%	3	1.5%	0	0.0%	197
	MILLER	34	12.6%	0	0.0%	144	53.3%	76	28.1%	7	2.6%	9	3.3%	270
	MONITEAU	21	16.7%	6	4.8%	53	42.1%	41	32.5%	4	3.2%	1	0.8%	126
	MORGAN	27	11.9%	7	3.1%	105	46.5%	79	35.0%	3	1.3%	5	2.2%	226
	NEWTON	46	9.5%	14	2.9%	273	56.2%	146	30.0%	4	0.8%	3	0.6%	486
	OZARK	21	18.9%	11	9.9%	34	30.6%	45	40.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	111
	POLK	41	9.9%	14	3.4%	214	51.6%	126	30.4%	0	0.0%	20	4.8%	415
	ST CLAIR	11	10.5%	2	1.9%	44	41.9%	48	45.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	105
	STONE	21	7.4%	0	0.0%	153	53.7%	105	36.8%	0	0.0%	6	2.1%	285
	TANEY	56	8.6%	20	3.1%	264	40.7%	290	44.8%	8	1.2%	10	1.5%	648
	VERNON	20	9.3%	4	1.9%	114	53.0%	71	33.0%	2	0.9%	4	1.9%	215
	WEBSTER	50	11.9%	22	5.2%	102	24.3%	230	54.8%	6	1.4%	10	2.4%	420
	WRIGHT	30	13.2%	11	4.8%	100	43.9%	81	35.5%	2	0.9%	4	1.8%	228
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>1,096</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>6,408</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>4,155</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>12,461</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	341	6.3%	189	3.5%	2,628	48.5%	1,784	32.9%	42	0.8%	440	8.1%	5,424
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2,628</b>	<b>48.5%</b>	<b>1,784</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>5,424</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	74	3.8%	56	2.9%	1,033	53.1%	574	29.5%	45	2.3%	165	8.5%	1,947
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	107	2.9%	143	3.8%	1,681	45.1%	1,450	38.9%	125	3.4%	223	6.0%	3,729
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2,714</b>	<b>47.8%</b>	<b>2,024</b>	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>5,676</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	16	2.8%	18	3.1%	213	37.2%	323	56.5%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	572
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>56.5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>572</b>
STATE TOTAL		<b>3,844</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>1,542</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>23,321</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>15,923</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>847</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>2,136</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>47,613</b>

## Appendix G: FY 2021 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	3	30.0%	4	40.0%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	6	60.0%	10
	ATCHISON	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	4
	BUCHANAN	35	43.8%	42	52.5%	8	10.0%	1	1.3%	0	0.0%	17	21.3%	80
	CALDWELL	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	CARROLL	1	16.7%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	6
	CASS	22	36.7%	22	36.7%	7	11.7%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	31	51.7%	60
	CHARITON	3	50.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	CLAY	18	26.1%	19	27.5%	8	11.6%	2	2.9%	0	0.0%	45	65.2%	69
	CLINTON	5	45.5%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	11
	COOPER	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	5
	DAVISS	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	DE KALB	2	66.7%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3
	GENTRY	1	16.7%	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	GRUNDY	8	72.7%	6	54.5%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	HARRISON	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	7
	HOLT	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	JOHNSON	9	36.0%	8	32.0%	4	16.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	12	48.0%	25
	LAFAYETTE	7	30.4%	8	34.8%	5	21.7%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	15	65.2%	23
	LINN	5	41.7%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	7	58.3%	12
	LIVINGSTON	1	12.5%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	MERCER	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2
	NODAWAY	3	37.5%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	PETTIS	4	13.8%	10	34.5%	4	13.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	20	69.0%	29
	PLATTE	15	53.6%	8	28.6%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	15	53.6%	28
	PUTNAM	3	60.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	RAY	11	61.1%	9	50.0%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	33.3%	18
	SALINE	7	23.3%	16	53.3%	4	13.3%	0	0.0%	3	10.0%	11	36.7%	30
	SULLIVAN	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	WORTH	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>36.7%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>39.7%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>47.2%</b>	<b>479</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	6	18.8%	27	84.4%	2	6.3%	2	6.3%	1	3.1%	4	12.5%	32
	AUDRAIN	8	36.4%	10	45.5%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	10	45.5%	22
	BOONE	35	44.9%	40	51.3%	13	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	30.8%	78
	CALLAWAY	20	36.4%	22	40.0%	7	12.7%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	21	38.2%	55
	CLARK	2	18.2%	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11
	COLE	15	42.9%	19	54.3%	4	11.4%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	9	25.7%	35
	FRANKLIN	17	37.0%	22	47.8%	8	17.4%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	17	37.0%	46
	GASCONADE	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	HOWARD	1	12.5%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	KNOX	3	50.0%	6	100.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6
	LEWIS	3	30.0%	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	10
	LINCOLN	25	37.9%	36	54.5%	8	12.1%	2	3.0%	1	1.5%	20	30.3%	66
	MACON	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	8
	MARION	10	24.4%	29	70.7%	3	7.3%	4	9.8%	2	4.9%	11	26.8%	41
	MONROE	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	MONTGOMERY	5	27.8%	8	44.4%	4	22.2%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	6	33.3%	18
	OSAGE	3	60.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	PIKE	9	34.6%	14	53.8%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	38.5%	26
	RALLS	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	RANDOLPH	9	42.9%	8	38.1%	5	23.8%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	10	47.6%	21
	SCHUYLER	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	3
	SCOTLAND	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	SHELBY	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8
	ST CHARLES	64	33.9%	119	63.0%	30	15.9%	4	2.1%	3	1.6%	51	27.0%	189
	WARREN	9	45.0%	5	25.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	40.0%	20
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>738</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	BUTLER	27	47.4%	44	77.2%	10	17.5%	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	12	21.1%	57
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	20	40.8%	36	73.5%	5	10.2%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	10	20.4%	49
	CARTER	2	40.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	CRAWFORD	14	53.8%	14	53.8%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	23.1%	26
	DENT	8	44.4%	9	50.0%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	10	55.6%	18
	DUNKLIN	2	9.5%	11	52.4%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	57.1%	21



## Appendix G: FY 2021 Substantiated Incidents by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL INCIDENTS
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	31	53.4%	35	60.3%	6	10.3%	6	10.3%	0	0.0%	12	20.7%	58
	IRON	2	28.6%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	7
	JEFFERSON	46	36.2%	48	37.8%	12	9.4%	4	3.1%	0	0.0%	65	51.2%	127
	MADISON	10	55.6%	10	55.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	33.3%	18
	MARIES	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	MISSISSIPPI	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	6
	NEW MADRID	2	15.4%	5	38.5%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	61.5%	13
	OREGON	7	46.7%	10	66.7%	3	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	8	53.3%	15
	PEMISCOT	5	38.5%	6	46.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	23.1%	13
	PERRY	9	40.9%	14	63.6%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	27.3%	22
	PHELPS	12	44.4%	16	59.3%	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	1	3.7%	8	29.6%	27
	PULASKI	20	57.1%	23	65.7%	7	20.0%	2	5.7%	1	2.9%	5	14.3%	35
	REYNOLDS	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	5
	RIPLEY	10	50.0%	11	55.0%	4	20.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	8	40.0%	20
	SCOTT	6	30.0%	7	35.0%	2	10.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	20
	SHANNON	3	25.0%	9	75.0%	1	8.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	ST FRANCOIS	31	44.3%	31	44.3%	10	14.3%	2	2.9%	3	4.3%	31	44.3%	70
	STE GENEVIEVE	6	46.2%	6	46.2%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	STODDARD	3	15.0%	7	35.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	50.0%	20
	TEXAS	7	36.8%	10	52.6%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	1	5.3%	7	36.8%	19
	WASHINGTON	16	41.0%	25	64.1%	8	20.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	38.5%	39
	WAYNE	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	11
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>763</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	1	12.5%	4	50.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	BARTON	4	30.8%	5	38.5%	3	23.1%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	13
	BATES	4	50.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	37.5%	8
	BENTON	7	46.7%	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	33.3%	15
	CAMDEN	7	28.0%	14	56.0%	2	8.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	5	20.0%	25
	CEDAR	4	30.8%	5	38.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	53.8%	13
	CHRISTIAN	16	44.4%	13	36.1%	4	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	52.8%	36
	DADE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	DALLAS	4	40.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	DOUGLAS	4	44.4%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9
	GREENE	73	45.3%	60	37.3%	35	21.7%	10	6.2%	1	0.6%	68	42.2%	161
	HENRY	3	33.3%	4	44.4%	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%	9
	HICKORY	6	50.0%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	7	58.3%	12
	JASPER	27	37.5%	25	34.7%	6	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33	45.8%	72
	LACLEDE	13	34.2%	19	50.0%	5	13.2%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	10	26.3%	38
	LAWRENCE	3	25.0%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	8	66.7%	12
	MCDONALD	6	60.0%	7	70.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	MILLER	7	35.0%	11	55.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	20.0%	20
	MONITEAU	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	MORGAN	4	22.2%	14	77.8%	6	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	18
	NEWTON	6	30.0%	8	40.0%	1	5.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	9	45.0%	20
	OZARK	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	POLK	10	45.5%	8	36.4%	3	13.6%	1	4.5%	0	0.0%	13	59.1%	22
	ST CLAIR	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5
	STONE	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3
	TANEY	20	33.9%	23	39.0%	6	10.2%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	26	44.1%	59
	VERNON	5	38.5%	4	30.8%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	13
	WEBSTER	16	47.1%	21	61.8%	5	14.7%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	11	32.4%	34
	WRIGHT	2	11.8%	8	47.1%	3	17.6%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	9	52.9%	17
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>38.3%</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>43.5%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4.2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>41.4%</b>	<b>671</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	120	43.5%	77	27.9%	40	14.5%	10	3.6%	2	0.7%	1480	536.2%	276
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>43.5%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>27.9%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>14.5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1480</b>	<b>536.2%</b>	<b>276</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	76	43.7%	66	37.9%	18	10.3%	9	5.2%	1	0.6%	77	44.3%	174
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	106	38.5%	111	40.4%	34	12.4%	7	2.5%	1	0.4%	104	37.8%	275
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>40.5%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>39.4%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>40.3%</b>	<b>449</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	45	45.9%	28	28.6%	4	4.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	37.8%	98
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28.6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37.8%</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,343</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>1,590</b>	<b>45.8%</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>2,712</b>	<b>78.1%</b>	<b>3,473</b>

A substantiated incident may have up to 6 categories of abuse/neglect. An incident will be counted for each type of abuse/neglect while the total column is a distinct count of substantiated incidents.

## Appendix H: FY 2021 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL CHILDREN
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	3	23.1%	7	53.8%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	13
	ATCHISON	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	4
	BUCHANAN	39	37.1%	61	58.1%	9	8.6%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	21	20.0%	105
	CALDWELL	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4
	CARROLL	2	25.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	8
	CASS	26	35.6%	32	43.8%	8	11.0%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	33	45.2%	73
	CHARITON	3	30.0%	6	60.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	CLAY	18	22.5%	24	30.0%	12	15.0%	2	2.5%	0	0.0%	49	61.3%	80
	CLINTON	6	50.0%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	12
	COOPER	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	5
	DAVISS	3	100.0%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	3
	DE KALB	3	75.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4
	GENTRY	1	7.7%	9	69.2%	4	30.8%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	GRUNDY	10	58.8%	10	58.8%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	17
	HARRISON	3	30.0%	7	70.0%	4	40.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	10
	HOLT	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2
	JOHNSON	9	26.5%	14	41.2%	5	14.7%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	15	44.1%	34
	LAFAYETTE	7	29.2%	9	37.5%	5	20.8%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	15	62.5%	24
	LINN	5	33.3%	6	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	15
	LIVINGSTON	1	10.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	10
	MERCER	0	0.0%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	8
	NODAWAY	3	33.3%	4	44.4%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	9
	PETTIS	5	13.5%	12	32.4%	6	16.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25	67.6%	37
	PLATTE	17	48.6%	13	37.1%	4	11.4%	0	0.0%	2	5.7%	17	48.6%	35
	PUTNAM	3	60.0%	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	5
	RAY	11	39.3%	18	64.3%	8	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	28.6%	28
	SALINE	8	16.0%	33	66.0%	6	12.0%	0	0.0%	8	16.0%	11	22.0%	50
	SULLIVAN	6	66.7%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9
	WORTH	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>31.4%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>47.5%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>40.3%</b>	<b>628</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	7	14.3%	41	83.7%	2	4.1%	2	4.1%	3	6.1%	5	10.2%	49
	AUDRAIN	10	30.3%	18	54.5%	3	9.1%	1	3.0%	3	9.1%	14	42.4%	33
	BOONE	45	38.8%	62	53.4%	19	16.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	24.1%	116
	CALLAWAY	21	25.9%	42	51.9%	10	12.3%	1	1.2%	0	0.0%	24	29.6%	81
	CLARK	3	16.7%	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	18
	COLE	18	32.1%	37	66.1%	8	14.3%	3	5.4%	0	0.0%	14	25.0%	56
	FRANKLIN	19	33.3%	29	50.9%	11	19.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	17	29.8%	57
	GASCONADE	2	20.0%	5	50.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	HOWARD	1	11.1%	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	9
	KNOX	5	50.0%	10	100.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10
	LEWIS	3	15.8%	13	68.4%	8	42.1%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	19
	LINCOLN	27	28.4%	61	64.2%	15	15.8%	2	2.1%	1	1.1%	21	22.1%	95
	MACON	3	30.0%	5	50.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	60.0%	10
	MARION	16	26.2%	45	73.8%	3	4.9%	4	6.6%	2	3.3%	12	19.7%	61
	MONROE	0	0.0%	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	10
	MONTGOMERY	6	28.6%	9	42.9%	6	28.6%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	6	28.6%	21
	OSAGE	3	42.9%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	7
	PIKE	10	27.8%	22	61.1%	3	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	30.6%	36
	RALLS	5	41.7%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	12
	RANDOLPH	10	34.5%	13	44.8%	6	20.7%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	11	37.9%	29
	SCHUYLER	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5
	SCOTLAND	2	18.2%	7	63.6%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	11
	SHELBY	1	5.6%	16	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	18
	ST CHARLES	72	27.7%	180	69.2%	47	18.1%	5	1.9%	4	1.5%	54	20.8%	260
	WARREN	9	36.0%	10	40.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	32.0%	25
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>666</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>1,058</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	5	31.3%	7	43.8%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	37.5%	16
	BUTLER	34	39.5%	69	80.2%	14	16.3%	4	4.7%	0	0.0%	13	15.1%	86
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	25	33.8%	60	81.1%	6	8.1%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	11	14.9%	74
	CARTER	2	22.2%	8	88.9%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9
	CRAWFORD	17	44.7%	24	63.2%	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	18.4%	38
	DENT	11	47.8%	11	47.8%	3	13.0%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	11	47.8%	23
	DUNKLIN	2	5.9%	21	61.8%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	47.1%	34

## Appendix H: FY 2021 Substantiated Children by Category of Abuse/Neglect

REGION	COUNTY	PHYSICAL ABUSE		NEGLECT		EMOTIONAL ABUSE		MEDICAL NEGLECT		EDUCATIONAL NEGLECT		SEXUAL ABUSE		TOTAL CHILDREN
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	39	43.3%	61	67.8%	10	11.1%	7	7.8%	0	0.0%	15	16.7%	90
	IRON	2	25.0%	5	62.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	50.0%	8
	JEFFERSON	54	33.1%	74	45.4%	18	11.0%	4	2.5%	0	0.0%	73	44.8%	163
	MADISON	10	41.7%	16	66.7%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	25.0%	24
	MARIES	2	50.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4
	MISSISSIPPI	0	0.0%	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	7
	NEW MADRID	2	11.1%	10	55.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	44.4%	18
	OREGON	8	42.1%	14	73.7%	7	36.8%	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	8	42.1%	19
	PEMISCOT	6	31.6%	11	57.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.8%	19
	PERRY	13	39.4%	25	75.8%	3	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	18.2%	33
	PHELPS	15	40.5%	22	59.5%	5	13.5%	3	8.1%	1	2.7%	9	24.3%	37
	PULASKI	21	44.7%	34	72.3%	9	19.1%	2	4.3%	1	2.1%	6	12.8%	47
	REYNOLDS	4	44.4%	6	66.7%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	2	22.2%	9
	RIPLEY	10	41.7%	14	58.3%	4	16.7%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	9	37.5%	24
	SCOTT	6	25.0%	10	41.7%	3	12.5%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	10	41.7%	24
	SHANNON	3	12.0%	20	80.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.0%	25
	ST FRANCOIS	34	34.3%	56	56.6%	17	17.2%	2	2.0%	3	3.0%	34	34.3%	99
	STE GENEVIEVE	9	45.0%	9	45.0%	6	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	20.0%	20
	STODDARD	3	8.8%	16	47.1%	7	20.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	32.4%	34
	TEXAS	13	36.1%	23	63.9%	1	2.8%	1	2.8%	2	5.6%	8	22.2%	36
	WASHINGTON	19	38.8%	32	65.3%	12	24.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	34.7%	49
	WAYNE	4	26.7%	8	53.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	15
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>673</b>	<b>62.1%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>1,084</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	1	7.1%	8	57.1%	2	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	42.9%	14
	BARTON	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	3	20.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	6	40.0%	15
	BATES	7	63.6%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11
	BENTON	10	47.6%	17	81.0%	3	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	23.8%	21
	CAMDEN	8	20.5%	25	64.1%	4	10.3%	2	5.1%	2	5.1%	5	12.8%	39
	CEDAR	5	33.3%	7	46.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	46.7%	15
	CHRISTIAN	17	39.5%	19	44.2%	4	9.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	48.8%	43
	DADE	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
	DALLAS	4	36.4%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	11
	DOUGLAS	4	26.7%	13	86.7%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	4	26.7%	15
	GREENE	86	40.6%	90	42.5%	54	25.5%	15	7.1%	2	0.9%	76	35.8%	212
	HENRY	4	30.8%	7	53.8%	5	38.5%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%	4	30.8%	13
	HICKORY	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	5	25.0%	7	35.0%	20
	JASPER	36	39.6%	37	40.7%	8	8.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	35	38.5%	91
	LACLEDE	14	28.6%	29	59.2%	5	10.2%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	11	22.4%	49
	LAWRENCE	3	20.0%	6	40.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	9	60.0%	15
	MCDONALD	7	53.8%	10	76.9%	2	15.4%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	3	23.1%	13
	MILLER	7	26.9%	17	65.4%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	15.4%	26
	MONITEAU	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1
	MORGAN	4	13.8%	24	82.8%	9	31.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	29
	NEWTON	6	20.7%	15	51.7%	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	0	0.0%	11	37.9%	29
	OZARK	3	30.0%	5	50.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	10
	POLK	12	44.4%	13	48.1%	5	18.5%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	15	55.6%	27
	ST CLAIR	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	7
	STONE	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3
	TANEY	26	31.0%	43	51.2%	9	10.7%	2	2.4%	0	0.0%	28	33.3%	84
	VERNON	5	38.5%	4	30.8%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	6	46.2%	13
	WEBSTER	22	40.0%	37	67.3%	9	16.4%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	17	30.9%	55
	WRIGHT	2	8.7%	13	56.5%	7	30.4%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	10	43.5%	23
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>34.1%</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>904</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	137	40.4%	122	36.0%	54	15.9%	12	3.5%	6	1.8%	151	44.5%	339
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>40.4%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>15.9%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>339</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST LOUIS CITY	83	39.2%	93	43.9%	26	12.3%	10	4.7%	2	0.9%	81	38.2%	212
	ST LOUIS COUNTY	118	35.9%	146	44.4%	44	13.4%	7	2.1%	1	0.3%	113	34.3%	329
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>37.2%</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>44.2%</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>35.9%</b>	<b>541</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	48	35.8%	52	38.8%	10	7.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	48	35.8%	134
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>35.8%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38.8%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>35.8%</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>STATE TOTAL</b>		<b>1,563</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>2,520</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>654</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>4,688</b>

A substantiated child may have up to 6 categories of abuse/neglect. A child will be counted for each type of abuse/neglect while the total column is a distinct count of substantiated children.

## Appendix I: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
NORTHWEST	ANDREW	0	0	0	0	1
	ATCHISON	0	0	0	0	0
	BUCHANAN	2	4	1	1	1
	CALDWELL	0	0	0	0	0
	CARROLL	0	0	0	0	0
	CASS	0	0	0	0	0
	CHARITON	0	1	1	0	0
	CLAY	0	1	4	2	0
	CLINTON	0	0	0	1	1
	COOPER	0	0	0	0	0
	DAVIESS	0	0	0	0	0
	DE KALB	0	0	0	0	0
	GENTRY	0	1	0	0	0
	GRUNDY	0	0	0	0	0
	HARRISON	0	0	0	0	0
	HOLT	0	0	0	0	0
	JOHNSON	0	0	0	0	0
	LAFAYETTE	0	0	0	0	0
	LINN	0	0	1	0	0
	LIVINGSTON	0	0	0	0	0
	MERCER	0	0	0	0	0
	NODAWAY	0	0	0	0	0
	PETTIS	0	0	0	0	1
	PLATTE	1	0	0	1	1
	PUTNAM	0	0	0	0	0
	RAY	0	0	0	0	0
	SALINE	1	0	0	1	0
	SULLIVAN	0	0	0	0	0
	WORTH	0	0	0	0	0
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
NORTHEAST	ADAIR	0	1	0	1	0
	AUDRAIN	0	0	0	0	0
	BOONE	0	1	1	0	1
	CALLAWAY	0	1	0	0	0
	CLARK	0	0	0	0	1
	COLE	0	0	1	0	1
	FRANKLIN	2	2	0	0	2
	GASCONADE	0	0	0	0	0
	HOWARD	0	0	0	0	0
	KNOX	0	0	0	1	0
	LEWIS	0	0	1	0	0
	LINCOLN	1	1	0	0	2
	MACON	0	1	0	0	0
	MARION	0	0	0	0	2
	MONROE	0	0	0	0	0
	MONTGOMERY	0	0	0	0	0
	OSAGE	0	0	0	1	0
	PIKE	0	0	0	0	1
	RALLS	0	0	0	2	0
	RANDOLPH	0	0	0	1	0
	SCHUYLER	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTLAND	0	0	0	0	0
	SHELBY	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. CHARLES	2	3	2	0	3
	WARREN	0	0	0	0	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>
SOUTHEAST	BOLLINGER	0	0	0	1	0
	BUTLER	0	0	1	0	2
	CAPE GIRARDEAU	0	2	1	0	0
	CARTER	0	0	0	0	0
	CRAWFORD	0	2	0	0	0
	DENT	0	0	0	0	1
	DUNKLIN	1	0	0	0	0

## Appendix I: Substantiated CA/N Fatalities by Fiscal Year

	COUNTY	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
SOUTHEAST	HOWELL	1	0	1	0	0
	IRON	0	0	0	0	0
	JEFFERSON	3	1	0	3	3
	MADISON	0	0	0	0	0
	MARIES	0	0	1	0	0
	MISSISSIPPI	0	0	1	0	0
	NEW MADRID	0	2	0	1	0
	OREGON	0	0	0	0	0
	PEMISCOT	0	0	1	1	0
	PERRY	0	0	0	0	0
	PHELPS	0	0	0	1	0
	PULASKI	0	1	1	1	0
	REYNOLDS	0	0	1	1	0
	RIPLEY	0	0	0	0	0
	SCOTT	1	0	1	1	0
	SHANNON	0	0	0	0	0
	ST. FRANCOIS	1	1	0	1	0
	STE. GENEVIEVE	0	0	0	1	0
	STODDARD	0	0	0	0	1
	TEXAS	0	0	0	0	1
	WASHINGTON	0	1	0	1	1
	WAYNE	0	0	0	1	0
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>
SOUTHWEST	BARRY	0	0	0	0	0
	BARTON	0	0	0	0	1
	BATES	0	0	0	0	0
	BENTON	0	0	0	0	1
	CAMDEN	0	0	0	0	0
	CEDAR	0	0	0	1	0
	CHRISTIAN	1	2	0	0	0
	DADE	0	0	0	0	0
	DALLAS	0	0	0	1	1
	DOUGLAS	0	0	1	0	0
	GREENE	1	2	1	0	2
	HENRY	0	0	1	0	0
	HICKORY	0	0	0	0	0
	JASPER	0	2	1	1	0
	LACLEDE	0	1	0	1	1
	LAWRENCE	0	0	0	1	0
	MCDONALD	0	0	0	0	0
	MILLER	0	0	2	0	1
	MONITEAU	2	0	0	0	0
	MORGAN	0	0	0	0	0
	NEWTON	0	0	0	0	0
	OZARK	0	1	0	0	0
	POLK	0	1	0	0	2
	ST CLAIR	0	0	0	0	0
	STONE	0	1	0	0	0
	TANEY	1	0	0	0	0
	VERNON	0	0	0	0	0
	WEBSTER	3	0	0	0	0
	WRIGHT	0	0	1	0	1
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>
KANSAS CITY	JACKSON	5	2	4	1	7
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
ST. LOUIS	ST. LOUIS CITY	8	1	3	7	4
	ST. LOUIS COUNTY	6	6	9	9	13
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>
OTHER	OUT HOME INV	2	3	0	1	3
	<b>*REGION TOTAL*</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
STATE TOTAL		45	49	44	49	65

---

## ***Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

### **Legal**

The Missouri Child Abuse Law, Section 210.110 RSMo defines:

**Abuse** as any physical injury, sexual abuse, or emotional abuse inflicted on a child other than by accidental means by those responsible for the child's care, custody, and control, except that discipline including spanking, administered in a reasonable manner, shall not be construed to be abuse. Victims of abuse shall also include any victims of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking as those terms are defined in 22 U.S.C. 78 Section 7102(9)-(10).

**Neglect** as failure to provide, by those responsible for the care, custody, and control of the child, the proper or necessary support, education as required by law, nutrition or medical, surgical, or any other care necessary for the child's well-being. Victims of neglect shall also include any victims of sex trafficking or severe forms of trafficking as those terms are defined in 22 U.S.C. 78 Section 7102(9)-(10).

**Sex trafficking** is defined as the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act.

**Severe forms of trafficking in persons** is defined as:

(A) Sex trafficking in which a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age; or

(B) The recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery.

**Care, custody and control** of the child includes, but is not limited to:

- The parents or legal guardians of the child;
- Other members of the child's household;
- Those exercising supervision over a child for any part of a twenty-four hour day;
- Any adult person who has access to the child based on relationship to the parents of the child or members of the child's household or the family;
- Any person who takes control of the child by deception, force, or coercion; or
- School personnel, contractors and volunteers, if the relationship with the child was established through the school or through school-related activities, even if the alleged abuse or neglect occurred outside of school hours or off school grounds.

**Investigation** is the collection of physical and verbal evidence to determine if a child has been abused or neglected.

**Assessment and services** provides for a prompt assessment of a child and their family when the child has been reported to the CD as a victim of abuse or neglect by a person responsible for that child's care, custody or control. Assessments include the provision of community-based services to reduce the risk of abuse and neglect and to support the family. This approach takes the place of the traditional investigation.

---

## ***Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

**Juvenile assessments:** As of August 28, 2015 the Children's Division utilizes a family assessment and services approach when reports are received containing concerns of children with problem sexual behaviors. A child with problem sexual behavior is defined as 'any person, under fourteen years of age, who has allegedly committed sexual abuse against another child'. These reports are screened by the Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline Unit when any child under the age of fourteen (14) is alleged to have committed an act of sexual abuse against any person under the age of eighteen (18). Prior to May 2018, non-caretaker referrals, investigations, or traditional assessments may all have met criteria for a juvenile report. In May 2018, CD policy allowed juvenile reports to be treated like Family Assessments and the system was changed to be able to track the report as juvenile.

**Differential response assessments** are those assessments determined by the family, CD worker and supervisor as needing more intensive work, Its' purpose is to provide the family with needed resources, support and services to further promote safety and well-being of the family during the assessment period.

**RSMo 210.115. Reports of abuse or neglect, who shall make** – When any physician, medical examiner, coroner, dentist, chiropractor, optometrist, podiatrist, resident, intern, nurse, hospital or clinic personnel that are engaged in the examination, care, treatment, or research of persons, and any other health practitioner, psychologist, mental health professional, social worker, day care center worker or other child care worker, juvenile officer, probation or parole officer, jail or detention center personnel, teacher, principal or other school official, minister as provided by section 352.400, RSMo, peace officer or law enforcement official, or other person with responsibility for the care of children, has reasonable cause to suspect that a child has been or may be subjected to abuse or neglect or observes a child being subjected to conditions or circumstances which would reasonably result in abuse or neglect, that person shall immediately report or cause a report to be made to the division in accordance with the provisions of sections 210.109 to 210.183.

**RSMo 352.400** - Christian Science practitioners were added to the definition of ministers with regard to the individuals required to report incidents of suspected child abuse/neglect. Minister is defined as "any person while practicing as a minister of the gospel, clergyperson, priest, rabbi, Christian Science practitioner, or other person serving in a similar capacity for any religious organization who is responsible for or who has supervisory authority over one who is responsible for the care, custody, and control of a child", effective August 28, 2003.

---

## ***Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

### **Operational**

At the end of each child abuse/neglect investigation/assessment, the Children's Service Worker reaches a conclusion.

The following are operational definitions for **Investigative** conclusions:

**Substantiated:** A finding that abuse/neglect has occurred or is occurring as a result of the observation of visible signs, physical and/or credible verbal evidence provided to the Children's Service Worker by the child, perpetrator or witnesses in accordance with the definitions of abuse/neglect. This includes cases which are adjudicated by the courts and those with preponderance of evidence.

**Unsubstantiated-Preventive Services Indicated:** A finding that insufficient visible signs, physical and/or credible evidence exist, but where the Children's Service Worker determines that indicators are present which, if unresolved, could potentially contribute to child abuse/neglect.

**Unsubstantiated:** A finding that insufficient physical or credible verbal evidence exists and where few or no indicators are identified and the Children's Service worker has not identified a specific threat exists for the child.

The following are definitions for **Assessment** conclusions:

**Agency Responded Refer to FCS or AC Case Opened:** The Division responded to the report and at some point during the assessment period referred the family to Family Centered Services (FCS) or the child was taken into custody and Alternative Care (AC) case was opened.

**Agency Responded Services Provided:** The Division responded to the report and found concerns in the home.

**Agency Responded Concerns Addressed:** The Division responded to the report and found concerns in the home but those concerns were addressed during the assessment process, community resources or other resources from staff.

**Agency Responded No Concerns Found:** The Division responded to the report, assured the safety of the children, spoke with parents/caretaker, made a home visit and found the allegations in the report to have no merit.

**Family Declined Services Child Safe:** The Division offered to provide Differential Response services but the family refused. CD staff was able to document the child was safe.

**Family Uncooperative Child Safe:** The Division offered to provide Differential Response services but the family refused. CD staff was able to document the child was safe.



---

## ***Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

For a small number of reports, the definitions on the previous page are not applicable. Other conclusions for either investigations or assessments include **Unable to Locate, Inappropriate Report, Located Out of State, Home Schooling, Already Investigated,** and **School Investigation by School Board (Substantiated, Unsubstantiated, Unresolved).**

### **Methodological**

The following are technical definitions used in the computations of the statistics throughout this report:

**Reported incident:** An allegation of child abuse/neglect made to the hotline which meets the legal definitions for abuse/neglect and for care, custody, and control. A reported incident may involve more than one child and more than one alleged perpetrator. The terms "report," "incident" and "reported incident" are used interchangeably throughout this report.

**Incident conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion for each child and for each alleged perpetrator involved in an incident. If at least one child is substantiated, the incident is considered to be substantiated.

**Incident category of abuse/neglect:** Up to fifty findings of abuse/neglect can be assigned to each substantiated child. Each incident may have up to six categories of abuse/neglect because each child may be substantiated for different types of abuse/neglect. For incidents involving more than one child, each category of abuse/neglect is counted once if at least one child was substantiated for that category.

**Reported child:** A child named in a reported incident of child abuse/neglect. A child may be reported more than one time during the year, and unless otherwise indicated, counts of children are duplicated in this report.

**Child conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion for each child involved in an incident. For example, some children in the report may be substantiated while others may be unsubstantiated.

**Child category of abuse/neglect:** Each substantiated child may be assigned up to six categories of abuse/neglect.

**Alleged perpetrator:** A person named as the perpetrator in a reported incident of child abuse/neglect. An alleged perpetrator may be involved in more than one incident during the year. Unless otherwise indicated, counts of alleged perpetrators are duplicated in this report.

---

## ***Appendix J. Legal and Methodological Definitions***

---

**Alleged perpetrator conclusion:** The Children's Service Worker assigns a conclusion to each alleged perpetrator involved in an incident. One perpetrator in a report may be substantiated while another may be unsubstantiated.

**Substantiated perpetrator:** When a conclusion of an investigation in which the Division has made a determination of child abuse or neglect by a Preponderance of Evidence in accordance with the law and the allegations against the perpetrator are determined substantiated.